DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 104 466 JC 750 253

AUTHOR Moore, E. Maynard, Ed.
TITLE The Campus and the City: A Symposium.
PUB DATE 73
NOTE 67p.; Report of Symposium held in Chicago, Illinois, March 10-11, 1973

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; College Role; College Students; Community Education; Community Services; *Correctional Education; *Educational Objectives; *Higher Education; *Junior Colleges; Off Campus Facilities; Resource Allocations; Social Class; *Urban Education; Urban Universities

ABSTRACT

This symposium was planned to provide a format for Ph.D. candidates in the Union Graduate School to join with leaders in higher education in open discussion of current issues in urban higher education. This report presents the substance of the presentations as recorded at each of five sessions. In "The Urban Crisis: Higher Education Faces the City," Bob McGill and Joe M. Smith discuss university-community relationships, problems of the academically underprepared, instructional relevance and the city as a learning laboratory. In "Community Colleges and Open Access in Urban Areas," E. Maynard Moore discusses the barriers of low income in access to higher education and describes the community college with its open admissions policy as a panacea; he also discusses new ways for community colleges to help community residents. Charles Isaacs recommends that teachers try to learn from their students and that the community college campus become the city itself. In "New Challenges, New Responses for Higher Education," Leander Jones discusses his experiences teaching theater arts and broadcasting skills in a state penitentiary. James Brown discusses "Resource Management and Accountability in Higher Education." The final session is a round table discussion on "The Changing Purposes of Higher Education." (DC)

ED104466

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE CAMPUS AND THE CITY

A SYMPOSIUM

March 10-11, 1973
YMCA Hotel
Chicago, Illinois

JC 750 253

SYMPOSIUM on "THE CAMPUS and THE CITY"

CONFERENCE AGENDA

OPENING SESSION: Saturday, March 10, 1:30-4:00 p.m.
TOPIC: "The Urban Crisis: Higher Education Faces the City"
Presentations by: Bob McGill, St. Louis, Mo.
Joe M. Smith, Trenton, N.J.
Respondents: Clark E. Chipman
Doris Holleb

SESSION TWO: Saturday, March 10, 6:00-8:30 p.m.
TOPIC: "Community Colleges and Open Access in Urban Areas"
Presentations by: Maynard Moore, Chicago, Ill.
Charles Isaacs, Staten Island, N.Y.

SESSION THREE: Sunday, March 11, 9:00-11:30 a.m.
TOPIC: "New Challenges, New Responses for Higher Education"
Presentation by: Leander Jones, Chicago, Ill.
Respondent: William A. Charland

SESSION FOUR: Sunday, March 11, 12:00-2:00 p.m.
TOPIC: "Resource Management and Accountability in Higher Education"
Presentation by: James Brown, Washington, D.C.

SESSION FIVE: Sunday, March 11, 2:30-4:30 p.m.
TOPIC: "The Changing Purposes of Higher Education"
Round-Table Discussion: Dr. Jan Lecroy
Dr. John Eddy
Dr. George Bonham
Dr. William Birenbaum

THE CAMPUS AND THE CITY

CONTENTS

	page
Introduction	v
I. THE URBAN CRISIS: HIGHER EDUCATION FACES THE CITY	1
Presentation by Bob McGill: 1	
Presentation by Joe Smith: 5	
Discussion: 11	
II. COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND OPEN ACCESS IN URBAN AREAS	15
Presentation by Maynard Moore: 15	
Presentation by Charlie Isaacs: 24	
Discussion: 30	
III. NEW CHALLENGES, NEW RESPONSES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION	33
Presentation by Leander Jones: 33	
Discussion: 39	
IV. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION	45
Presentation by James Brown: 45	
Discussion: 47	
V. THE CHANGING PURPOSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION	51
Round-Table Discussion: 51	

ROSTER OF PARTICIPANTS

ANDREWS, Steve, Instructor and Director of ABACUS Project,
Central YMCA Community College, Chicago, Illinois

BIRENBAUM, William M., President, Staten Island Community College,
The City University of New York

BONHAM, George W., Editor-in-Chief, Change Magazine, NBW Tower,
New Rochelle, New York

BROWN, James, Vice-President for Administration and Finance,
Federal City College, Washington, D.C.

CHARLAND, William A., Director, University Without Walls,
Chicago State University, Chicago, Illinois

CHIPMAN, Clark E., Senior Program Officer - TRIO, Region V,
U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and
Welfare, Chicago, Illinois

DOWLING, Noreen, Dean, Liberal Arts and Sciences,
Central YMCA Community College, Chicago, Ill.

EDDY, John, Associate Professor of Higher Education and Director of
Graduate Training, Loyola University of Chicago

HOLLEB, Doris, Committee on Urban Studies, U. of Chicago;
Author of Colleges and the Urban Poor (Heath, 1972)

ISAACS, Charles, Facilitator for Constituent Groups,
Staten Island Community College, New York

JONES, Leander, Producer, TV College, City Colleges of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois

LECROY, Jan, Vice-Chancellor, Dallas County Community College
District, Dallas, Texas

LESTER, Virginia, Associate Dean, Empire State College,
State University of New York, Saratoga Springs, New York

LUECKE, Richard, Director of Studies, Urban Training Center for Christian Mission,
Chicago, and Professor of Philosophy, Christ College, Valparaiso Univ., Indiana

MCGILL, Bob, Community Organizer, Neighborhood House,
St. Louis, Missouri

MOORE, E. Maynard, Assistant Dean and Director, C-CHOICE Project, Central YMCA Community College, Chicago, Illinois

POLKINGHORNE, Donald E., Assistant Director of STudent Affairs, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri

ROSSER, Lawrence B., Executive Director, Chicago URBAN CORPS, and Instructor, Central YMCA Community College, Chicago, Illinois

SMITH, Joe M., Instructor, Educational Field Experiences, Trenton State College, Trenton, New Jersey

SOMERS, C. Norman, Director of Experimental Education and Associate Professor of English, Chicago State University, Chicago, Illinois

YASUTAKE, Michael, Counselor, Central YMCA Community College, Chicago, Illinois

THE CAMPUS AND THE CITY

Introduction

This Symposium was called to provide an occasion for me to talk with some other people -- leaders, friends and associates in Higher Education -- about some of the current issues in urban higher education. I selected these dates as the two days prior to the opening of the 28th Annual Conferency of the American Association of Higher Education, when a number of leaders in higher education would be in Chicago. For them, it was an occasion to talk with a few graduate students about some mutual concerns in an informal setting. Those who were planning to come to Chicago were delighted at the opportunity.

The focus for our discussions was to be The Campus and the City: Maximizing Assets and Reducing Liabilities, a Report and Recommendations by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, which had been published in December 1972. In this report, the Commission made recommendations primarily in three areas: (1) how to accentuate the assets and reduce the liabilities, (2) how to create more open-access places for students in areas that now have deficits, and (3) how to create mechanisms which will facilitate progress in solving problems. Among these new mechanisms, the Commission proposed development of two new agencies within metropolitan areas: the metropolitan higher education council, and the metropolitan educational opportunity counseling center. Support for these agencies would come from city, state and federal governments.

In addition, the Commission proposed two new programs:

-- "Urban-grant" allocations to ten carefully selected universities and colleges to see what they can do with imaginative overall approaches to urban problems. We suggest maximum grants of $10 million over a period of ten years, subject to periodic review at two-year intervals.

-- Creation of experimental learning pavilions attached to community colleges and to comprehensive colleges directed toward the learning needs of adults through the new technology, discussion groups, and other methods. We suggest that the new program for support of innovative efforts by higher education within HEW be open to such proposals.

The persons who participated in the Symposium did so less out of interest in what the Carnegie Commission had to say than out of their own commitments to higher education and interest in solving urban problems in their own localities. It meant that the presentations and discussions were much more open and creative than would have been true had the participants limited their remarks to the Commission's proposals. In this way, the Commission's report on The Campus and The City served as a point of reference and informed our discussion without binding it.

The Symposium was planned so as to provide a format for Ph.D. candidates in the Union Graduate School to share their thoughts and the results of some of their own work, to get feedback from others concerned about the same issues, and to join with leaders in higher education in open discussion on current trends. Participation was limited to twenty students with respondents and discussants invited to single sessions.

The report that follows presents the substance of the presentations and discussions as recorded at each session. The material has been edited considerably to facilitate reading, but an effort has been made to retain the sense of the spoken word and the "flavor" of the interaction taking place across the table. I apologize in advance if any participant feels I did him or her an injustice in reporting specific remarks. I tried to avoid putting words into peoples' mouths.

E. Maynard Moore
Chicago, Illinois

OPENING SESSION

"The Urban Crisis: Higher Education Faces the City"

Presentation by

Bob McGill
Community Organizer
St. Louis, Missouri

For the last two years, I've worked for the United Church of Christ in the inner city. Before that time, for about three years, I worked for the University of Missouri at Columbia, Missouri, in a department called Regional and Community Affairs. The University is a Land Grant institution. I really had two functions in the department. One was to work with students that were going out for their Master's degree; and secondly, I was particularly responsible for the field experience program. We had something like 60 students, I guess, in the department, probably, half of whom were engaged in education, the other half doing extension work backup to some of the people out in the field.

Back towards 1968, '69, and '70, there was considerable interest in Urban Affairs. So, it seemed that this type of a department, which is concerned with both teaching and action out in the field, with three, four, five of us on the faculty, ought to get a little more involved in Urban Affairs. Columbia, Missouri, is a small town located in the Central part of Missouri. It is not in either Kansas City or St. Louis, which are the two main urban areas in Missouri. So, as I reflect back on it, the four or five of us really tried to do about four different things as junior faculty members to push a whole department over a little bit further. The first thing, as I recall, is that we really tried, in faculty meetings and informal seminars, to promote a need in the department for a 60 hour Master's program. There was one course in the department which was related to Urban Community Development; and we though that there ought to be another course, or two courses or three courses - something more than three hours out of sixty hours. In fact, we wanted an optional major in Urban Affairs for our students.

The second thing that we were concerned with in this department was the social distribution of the students. Being in a small town, we were lily-white; we had no minority students or faculty members, just white students; we had a few foreign students from time to time from Africa, the Far East, the Middle East. However, we had no minority representation from Missouri. We said hey, "Why don't we go to St. Louis, why don't we go to Kansas City, where Black people live and see if we can't recruit someone to come here and add a little diversity to our department?"

The third thing we tried to do (this is something I guess I was more concerned with) was to get the students more heavily involved in urban areas rather than to run them out to some small town for their one semester field experience. We thought it would be great to get them into the inner city of Kansas City or St. Louis and see how far we could get in having them learn first-hand about urban problems and community development.

Two years ago, then, this coming September, when I was ready to do my thing with UGS, I said good-bye to the University and took a

leave-of-absence for a year, which turned into something permanent. I went from a fairly nice office on the seventh floor, overlooking the swimming pool, to St. Louis to a little Church Neighborhood House. On one side of us was an Urban Renewal area that in 1960 had a population of 10,000 and in 1970 had a population of 500 people. It looks like "Hiroshima Flats". Across the street from us in the other direction, is a Public Housing Agency, which has apartments (I think there are 12 or 15 high rises) for over 650 families, which are about two-thirds filled: about 450 families. The average income is something like $3,600 per year. Mostly mothers with two or three children, a few single people and a few older people; but I guess, 99.9% Black - I know of one white family living over there. It's just down the street from Pruitt-Igo. Pruitt-Igo doesn't have that many people; it has more buildings, but not that many people. So, we are caught right here between Urban Renewal on one side of us, and Public Housing on the other side of us.

There are four centers that we have in the Neighborhood Houses. One of the centers was getting ready to move; it's located to the south, not the one that I work out of directly but another one. So, they asked me if I would get involved in helping move this center, finding out where it ought to move to. I said sure. So, it dawned on me that the easiest, fastest and best way was to draw on my academic knowledge. So I called up one of the local universities and said hey, "You've got 1970 census data, why don't you break it out for this particular area that we want to move in to. The area is about a mile square. Tell us how many old people, how many young people, the age breakdown, and where the highest concentration of people are. And tell us pretty much where we ought to move this center and get our programs where they can be very effective."

Most centers, when they move, don't go through this census bit, yet they need that kind of data. But, he said, "I'm busy right now; I'll call you back next week and we'll set-up a date to get together." Well, this went on for about a month, until I finally realized he ain't going to call back. This was the Dept. of Urban Affairs, at one of our institutions; I discovered that the department itself (there may be a little more rumor in this, than fact) was rather new. The person who was the head of it, had recently come from the Political Science Department, and had taken this plunge of faith, I guess, into a new endeavor to try to establish a department that would be more relevant to the Urban Area. He was putting it together with a little hard money, but mostly soft money. The way he was trying to establish it over a period of time, was to get good students out of his department and into city government, particularly in the research and developmental agencies, in City Planning and Administration - in those positions where they had control of funds which went into research. His department, in turn, would be sitting right over there waiting to take the research grants back from the City. In this way, he could perpetuate his own department and continue to do his own kind of research and get grants for his students. Now, he had a nice little thing going for himself and he saw this as a way that he could stay very relevant. They would come out to neighborhood groups also. But, what we learned is that, when you picked up the phone, you've got to say - "I've got two or three thousand bucks; could you do a little study for us on the census." "Yeah, we can shake loose a Graduate student; we'll get the report out for you." But, we didn't have the two or three thousand bucks to give him, so they didn't return our call.

The second experience with this department wasn't much longer after this. Right down the street from us, within two blocks of the center where my office is, there's been a lot of controversy in St. Louis about putting in a large convention center. I think it's been about two or three times that it's been

voted down at the polls. It came up again last Fall. Associate professors from the department called us up and said, "This convention center needs some ADVERTISING. Have you got some students or some kids in the neighborhood who can go around putting flyers on people's doors to get them out to vote for the Center?" I don't know, I thought this was kind of straight - he was an Associate professor, in one of his official capacities. Until I stopped to analyze it. A $20 million convention center needs a lot of feasibility studies, a lot of impact studies, a lot of practical studies, and this sort of thing. And the institutions of Higher Learning are known to have large conventions for the convention centers that also help attract students to the University. Looking at it in that light, you can see why it's important for an Associate professor, wanting to do research, to get kids to go out and put flyers on people's doors. Also, I discovered that they did know where we lived; they did know our telephone number; and they could call us back if they wanted to - it was just getting something important enough for them to call us back about.

OK. We were beginning to get a picture about the department by this time. The third thing that we were engaged in with this same department, I suppose by coincidence, or perhaps not by coincidence, took place right after Christmas. I'm engaged in Housing, and we bought several lots on the South Side of the City. It is a run-down area. We've been trying to build some small houses on these lots (225 D3 if you're acquainted with this legislation). The Federal government has just recently, however, put a moratorium on housing programs. Anyway, we were at least making the effort. Someone would keep saying to us in City Planning "You've got a good idea, but - we can't let you build those houses yet." Right after Christmastime, a glorious report came out of the City Planning Department and they said for us, "In this one mile area, where you're going to move the mission, (the one I was talking about) where you want to build those houses, we're going to put a brand new "town-in-town". We're going to put it right there in that area. Your housing plans are going to fit beautifully. The Mayor made a pronouncement. We'll have a lake right in the middle of the development; it's going to be a beautiful thing. However, it doesn't include the people that now live in the area, so we'll move them out." A few days after that, someone from this same department in the institution, calls me and says, "Hey, McGill, why don't you come up and visit with us?" This was the first invitation that I had had to go up there and sit down and talk things over face-to-face. Come to find out, that this particular department was drawing up the plans for the new town. They were submitting the applications to the Department of Planning; it's also an area that is right next to the University, which of course is also very important.

Now let's step back, analyze it and look at this situation. If we're going to take seriously the report on the Nat'l Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, we see that St. Louis is a city that has lost a quarter of a million population in the last 20 years. In the last 20 years it has had 25,000 housing units torn down, and at the present time, it has another 25,000 housing units still standing that have been vandalized that are ready to be razed. This is 50,000 houses that are either sitting there, aren't there or shouldn't be there. In several reports, it has been called "the most abandoned city in the U.S." It's got a Black Core along the North Side of it with the white collar around the Black inner-city. I see this

University Department of Urban Affairs which, without doubting their intentions, is trying to do the best they can to be relevant to the inner city. Tied into this whole complex again is the City Government, the affluent, the whites. Most of us are familiar with this - this is the two Americas that are talked about in that Commission Report. I went back and re-read this, and found Dr. Kenneth Clark's statement that he made to this Commission, and I would like to share it with you. One of the first witnesses to be invited to appear before this Commission was Dr. Kenneth B. CLARK, a distinguished and perceptive scholar. Referring to the reports of earlier Riot Commissions he said: "I read that report of the 1919 rioting in Chicago, and it is as if I was reading the report of the Investigating Committee on the Harlem Riot of '35, the report of the Investigating Committee on the Watts Riot. I must again, in candor say to you members of this Commission, it is a kind of 'Alice in Wonderland,' the same moving picture, re-shown over and over again, the same analysis, the same recommendations, and the same inaction." That was a few years ago, but I would guess that that still holds very true.

To push this just a little bit further then, and I think this is pretty much the basis of what I want to share with you, it seems to me that in St. Louis, (and I would guess in other cities also) that there is a lot of creativity taking place in the inner city and it's also taking place in many of the transitional areas right next to the inner-city. It seems like the one thing that can unify radicals and conservatives, doctors and lawyers and janitors, blacks and whites and chicanos, right down the line, is the fact that their neighborhoods are deteriorating in a human sense, and their schools are deteriorating in the whole bit. If you want to call a meeting in the neighborhood to talk about crime, everybody in the neighborhood will come and talk about crime. No sweat, people will come. There are some very creative things that are being done. When I hold back and look at society at arms-length, I think to break open this kind of creativity, something ought to be coming out of universities. Now, here we are sitting in the city of Saul Allinsky and Jesse Jackson, where there is this type of creativity. Granted, it is pretty risky for many universities to get into that type of Community Organization or something of a much milder form; but at least, there are models of community organization that have a rightful place in the university.

Secondly, it seems to me, that if a university can not see itself getting involved in the models of action, at least there is another place that they can become involved, very distinctly involved, whether it's through extension programs of a Land-Grant Institution or a continuing education program. When many groups of this kind meet together to form a neighborhood organization, they quite often have got the creativity and the good intentions, but they simply don't have the know-how to get the job done. They don't understand, quite often, the whole economic scene and financial scene. They can't see how and why real estate companies work and how they tie into the financial institutions and what mortgage bankers do, for instance. And yet, if they did simply understand more of these kinds of things, they could do so much more toward achieving their goals. Sometimes all it takes is a professor standing up there and giving a lecture on these kinds of things, after which the whole social scene would become much clearer; I've seen a few instances of this when a professor who's got his job does something on the side that is not part of his job, comes down and joins a community group. And, he can become very effective if he is willing to work at it: the fact that he might be making $25,000 yet is sitting down in a room full of people, five or ten or even more, can bridge that sort of gap. The university has got that sort of resource, and we must encourage more activities such as this as part of the reward system. It will be then that the university will become part of the life of the city in ways that the Carnegie Commission would support.

Presentation by

Joe M. Smith
Trenton State College, New Jersey

As a U.G.S. Student, I am theoretically learning how to discipline myself to get my Doctoral degree. I found this symposium helpful for productivity. I teach teachers, how to teach secondary level in the inner city, at Trenton State College in New Jersey. And a whole lot of that is how to survive in the community and the ghetto because of their lousy planning. This is the context of my remarks which have to do with relating Higher Education to the Urban area.

When we talk about that, we're really talking about relating higher education to alien groups, for obvious reasons with which we are all familiar. The cities have changed; the cities are now places where the poor, the Black, the minorities of various sorts congregate. These groups, if not entirely alien, can not be considered part of the Higher education mainstream.

Higher Education has said for a long time that it has a role to play with the lower classes; in fact, the charter of Harvard College says that the college was "founded for the education of English and Indian youth of this country in knowledge and Godliness." Cornell, of course, when it was established, set-up a scholarship for one student in every district of the state of New York, to get a free ride through four years of Cornell; that is what the school was originally endowed to do. Of course, there were a few hookers: the following pages of the Harvard charter said the things that you needed to do to get in. This meant that you had to be fluent in Latin and Greek and a number of other things. I really don't know how many American Indians Harvard has admitted and educated over the years; I would really like to find out; I kind of suspect that they've educated more India-Indians than American Indians. Of course, Cornell's wonderful proclamation for this free education was directed towards the working class youth, and it stated that in its original intentions. But, one had to graduate from secondary school, an academic secondary school. How many poor and working-class kids could ever get through a secondary school and take advantage of that? In those days, people couldn't afford to have their kid in school that long. I think this historical perspective demonstrates precisely how Higher Education has addressed itself over the years to the Urban areas.

Urban areas now are basically working-class poor communities or reservations for the very rich. On the basis of looking at the very rich, colleges are very comfortable educating them; but in terms of relating to the other side, they do not do a very good job. The barriers that were up before are still up today, only in a different form - they're more sophisticated. Since World War II, colleges certainly have served as a form of upward mobility for the lower classes. However, there is a special technique that Higher Education demanded. You see, Higher Education has a definite belief, a religious belief (and it really is religious) as to how one acquires learning. All you have to do is walk onto any campus and you'll see precisely how one acquires learning: one reads books, sits in classrooms and listens to lectures, takes tests, writes papers, and accepts the values that are established throughout that academic milieu. So, in a real sense,

Higher Education has performed what I call "the conversion factor": It converts the lower classes to a middle class form of life.

I work in a college in New Jersey, and most of the state colleges in New Jersey cater to lower middle class and working class youth. And, I think it's been very well established that you can't come home after you've gone to college. There is a very definite barrier between kids who have gone to college and their parents who have not. One of the reasons for that is this conversion factor - the kids have been converted. If you know people who have gone from Methodism to Roman Catholicism or to Judism, you know they are the most ardent advocates of their new belief. And likewise, people who have gone from the lower classes into the middle class have accepted the values and beliefs of the middle class. More so than people who have been in there for a generation or two. This is reflected in our public schools. Where do most of our public school teachers come from but working class and lower class populations? What are the values of our High Schools, our public schools? They're middle class.

There's been an interesting study done up on the Iron Range in Duluth, Minnesota. I do not have the original study, but I read about it in "Saturday Review". Minnesota has taken a very interesting stand on a statewide basis. We've had integration on the basis of race; Minnesota is now saying, we must have integration on the basis of economic class. The socio-economic background for school usually determines how well students do, and Duluth was the context for a study of the results of that. I think there's something like 36 elementary schools in Duluth, and they're located in separated socio-economic class groups. That is, where there is a poor group, there is a poor elementary school which serves them; and likewise in the richer sections, there is an elementary school which serves them; and very rarely do the school boundaries and socio-economic community profiles ever cross.

One of the things that the study found is that in those areas where they do integrate, whenever there is 30% or below lower class youth in a school, all students did better; as soon as it got up to 33 or 34%, all students did worse. The control factor is the curriculum which is the same for all 36 elementary schoos; therefore, the cause for achievement differences must be the socio-economic background of the students. At least, that is the conclusion drawn from the study and that is why they have proceeded to integrate the schools on a class basis. There are two High Schools in Duluth, which makes possible further observations on achievement differences. Also, in Duluth there were less than 5% who were Black or of minority population. So we're really talking about a white population; it has nothing to do with race, but strictly, socio-economic background. I came to another conclusion when I read that: they ought to have a hell of a lot of different curriculums in the school system, and then maybe all the kids would succeed fairly well.

Another study that's very interesting, which I came across awhile ago, is in the Fall-Winter 1971 issue of the Canadian magazine called: "This Magazine Is About Schools". It's a good magazine, it really is. There's a study in this magazine of the Park School Community Council, which is composed of parents and teachers who live and work in a working class district in Toronto. The report was presented to their Board of Education in Toronto. It's the best study that I've seen done, in terms of really proving by statistical analysis what happens in a public school system based on the socio-economic background of a kid. For example, the attitude of the Board of Education and the Superintendent of Schools, is reflected in a trustee's remarks about intelligent parents having intelligent children, thus

accounting for the poor downtown children doing badly in school. The other comment he made was: "you can't race donkies against horses; that's why the kids in the lower economic groups didn't do well, because they were innately stupid." This is full of statistics - I'll just pull one more out. There are various "streams" in the public school system in Toronto, and it's divided - low class stream for special kids and so forth. The odds for lower class kids in this city getting into the highest stream of that system's schools, compared with kids from the upper middle class or middle class, are 67 to 1. That means that any kid in the city whose parents are on welfare, has 67 more chances to get into that lowest stream than someone from an upper income bracket.

This is not Higher Education, but it relates very directly to how we train our teachers and to how our teachers perceive what their responsibilities are. The guy who runs the school, I mean, he has his Doctorate. According to our system, he can't get more educated. Right? But what particularly concerns me are <u>public</u> institutions of Higher Education because they're responsible to the broader public (theoretically, at least) than are the private schools. Often, the reverse happens: private schools are more responsive to the public than public schools. Lower class families have permitted this sort of thing even though they recognize that their kids are going to be short-changed. Lower class families have permitted it, basically because they want a better life for their kids. And, if getting a college diploma will give them a better life, then let's have them go get it; because we want them to be better off than we were. Given this kind of background, I'm not sure how Higher Education can continue to be so confident in the processes that it's using today, nor the structures that it has; I think that it is incorrect to say (and I would never say) that the solution to all the problems of our society rests with Higher Education. And, I think that one of the fallacies that we in the society make, is that we make tremendous demands on those particular institutions, our educational institutions, which they're not competent to deal with. I guess one of the things which we have to clearly distinguish is: what is it that Higher Education can really do, and what can't it do?

One of the points that I think we have to recognize, when we're talking about structural change in Higher Education, is that the very structure by which we identify a college, has a great deal to do with what that college does. When you're talking about Higher Education relating to the Urban area, one of the first things we have to look at is the physical structure of Higher Education. When we talk about a College, immediately, what do we think of? Buildings. If we're talking about relating Higher Education to the Urban area, one of the worse things we can talk about is erecting more buildings. I've walked through New York, and as you come across Union Theological Seminary, and Columbia, sitting there side by side - one of the first things that impresses you are these massive walls that rise up, which really serve to block the neighborhood out. I think that reflects Higher Education's attitude towards the Urban area. If we're going to deal with people in the Urban area, who live there, regardless of class, a basic proposal that I would make is that it has to be a College without its own physical facilities. We must utilize those facilities which are already available in the community, and I don't think that's such a great task. If you don't do that, and you erect buildings, you immediately limit the kinds of educational processes that you're going to give your students. Because once you raise the building, then you must use it,

and that locks us in. I don't think many people are aware of the importance of physical space. Herbert Kohl has a beautiful thing in The Open Classroom. He talks about how to utilize a classroom. He walks in and he says, "Where is the front of the room?" Everyone points to the board where the teacher stands. "Where is the back of the room?" Everyone knows where that is. But that's really a misconception of what classroom space is. It's really vacant space that you can create into anything. And, I really think that Higher Education needs to have that same kind of perspective, in dealing with the Urban area. It must look at the space available in the Urban area, and then use that space for its own purposes.

I guess the second point which flows from that is the structure. The institutions, the people and the resources that are available in the Urban area must be defined almost like a library book. I bring this up because I'm reading: American Higher Education: A Documentary History, a fascinating two volumes by Holfstadter & Smith. It takes you up to 1958, I think, using excerpted documents from our educational heritage. Reading through these things you realize how important the Library is. They couldn't carry on the kinds of studies they wanted without a Library; through most of our history, education basically meant transmission of knowledge that they already had. Colleges were not set up to go after new research; research was not a function of Higher Education, at least from the documents in that book, until about 1860. That's the date where I discovered the term 'original research' and the man who was commenting on it said: "it's a new term that's in vogue, but what does it mean?" (I still ask that question)

But if we take this vogue term, and talk about "original research" and "original source material" (which we do at our Graduate levels - "do your own research with original source materials") what better thing could we do than to utilize those things which are in the city, which are a prime source material for studying the city. And that doesn't just have to be through an Urban Studies Dept.; that could be in Education, Planning, Medicine, what have you. What better prime source material can you have, and what lends itself more to the mode of academic thinking? However, academia rejects that argument. That's not considered prime source material.

I'll give you an example of what would be prime source material for Higher Education. A college in which I was working, a state college in South Jersey, was actually offered $60,000 by the Dept. of Community Affairs to establish an Urban Field Experience program for Sociology/ Political Science majors. They turned them down. They did not want the $60,000 because it would detract from the "educational excellence" of the Department. Everyone knows that you cannot learn Sociology and Political Science out in the field; you must learn it, especially at the undergraduate level, by studying books and attending lectures. They turned it down, they didn't want anything to do with it.

Let me get back, now that I've kind of indicated some areas of structural change, and offer some perceptions that we in Higher Education have to make. Those of us who are involved in the Urban area, and are trying to work in the Urban area, need to be aware of what Higher Education can do and can't do. One of the things that it can't do (at least, from my viewpoint) is be a Social Work Agency. Community service projects, which do not directly benefit the institution or in which the institution does not have an educational stake, shouldn't be pursued - no matter how much they benefit the community. Because, my experience has been that over the long haul they do not benefit the community. What happens is that, over a period of time,

however long they last, the institution looks for gratitude from the community; when they don't get it, which they don't, things get very bitter. And it usually ends with the people left to themselves, with no relationship or opportunity to work with the College at all. It would have been better not to have initiated those kinds of projects, and expectations would not have been built up. The other thing that happens, of course, when you do these sorts of social service projects, is that students go in with missionary zeal, and the poor know what missionaries are good for! Consequently, the projects usually end up rather sour.

One of the things I keep telling myself, as I try to work on my institution, is that institutional change, especially in Higher Education, is a slow process. For example, this idea of using the City as a resource is not new or original - other people have suggested that five or ten years ago. In fact, in 1830, George Bancroft suggested the same for either the City University of New York or NYU. The way he came up with these ideas was his having been in places like Munich, Vienna, and places in Europe which had great Libraries and Art Museums, and these resources were being used as part of the educational structure. Why don't we do it in America? If our Colleges work <u>together</u> with the city, we can really develop an educational resource. Finally, I think about two years ago, in Minnesota in the summer of 1971, the State College system established an Urban College - Minnesota Metropolitan State College. As I understand it, this college is attempting to do this kind of thing: to utilize the resources in the City as its learning environment. What I'm suggesting is that this is a new development in the right direction, while community service projects, I think, are out.

Another area of genuine concern for me is Open Admissions. I think Open Admissions has done a great deal to discourage and harm the poor rather than help them. What we've essentially said is that you have the right to fail - and fail they did. And people in Higher Education took this as the occasion to say "look,they weren't prepared - they really are stupid." I think Open Education without Compensatory Education is not a realistic formula. At least, this is my view having worked with kids from the poverty areas who have gone into College. The turnover is great; the open door then becomes the revolving door, as so many people have said. I think this is an area that we have to take a look at. What Higher Education is capable of doing is not offering Compensatory Education itself, but it is capable of developing systems for training people to give sound compensatory higher education; it has the resources for research, training and certification to develop these kinds of programs. And, if we're going to talk about admitting students into College, we have to talk about, at the same time, establishing Compensatory Education in the System, which will really give them an opportunity to succeed; but I don't think this should be established within the College itself. There are Adult Basic Education programs which are sponsored by the State, and there's federal money for it; and there are Adult Education programs at a more advanced level - people are getting their G. E. D.'s.

There are these things available that Higher Education can tie into. They can develop good programs, and, I think that's what Higher Education should address itself to, rather than "Come On In". I'm particularly, sensitive to this point, because New Jersey is the most urban state in the nation; and I think some of the things that

happen there that aren't happening yet in your state, will. We are having a leveling off and a decrease of admissions to our colleges, including our State Colleges. Yet one of the things that is happening in our State College is that we have dropped our admission standards to the lowest that they have ever been in history. Through some magic, they project grade point averages for kids, with one being the bottom and four being the top. We are now admitting students who have projected grade point averages (when they graduate) of 1.6, which means they are failing. Still, at this time, we do not have a program planned within the College for Compensatory Education. Now we are in a pinch, because we must admit these students to survive or we're going to have to fire some professors and some administrators. Because for each full-time equivalency student, we get $1550 from the State - and that's what keeps the place running. So, we've got to admit them. We are going to come under some fire though, if we keep turning them out after one year - very few make it through. That's one of the factors that, if it is not yet affecting your college or public school, probably will affect it - a leveling off or decrease in enrollment.

This summer I made a suggestion to our College, (which was rejected immediately) that we admit High School students from our inner-city schools who are able and capable of taking college courses but can't take them in the inner-city (there's no advance courses). The idea was that they could earn college credits. I worked it out with the Board of Education: they were willing to pay most of the tuition (they did it with a Community College in the area). Our Vice-President of Academic Affairs thought that it would be much better if he set up a committee and studied it for a year - to see what the outcome might be and what the implications were. However, since that time, most of the departments have been experiencing the projected decrease in enrollments. I mentioned the new idea to about three departments and they are all gung-ho! They want to get as many of those students in as possible, as soon as possible. We're short 300 students this semester which means a decrease of about $400,000 or something like that. It may sound terrible, talking about it this way, but, these are the kinds of facts that I think you need to know.

I think another trend, that's taking place in New Jersey and has for quite a while, is the movement of Higher Education out of the cities. At this point we have State Colleges and one State University. Of the eight State Colleges, only one is left in an Urban setting: Jersey City State College. All the others have either relocated themselves to more suburban or rural settings, or were already located there. Thenthe Community College system was established in New Jersey, so now almost every county has its own Community College. They were originally intended to be in the highly populated areas - in the Urban areas. However, out of 19 or 20, there are maybe three left in an Urban area. All the rest have, I think, removed themselves. Trenton is a prime example of that. At one time Trenton had two four year Colleges and one Junior College - today it has none. I think that that represents the trend. Trenton State College moved out about 25 years ago, after World War II; Ryder College moved out in the early sixties; and Mercer County Community College just moved out last year. All of them moved to pastoral settings.

Also, to give you an indication of what New Jersey's interpretation of what an urban setting is: Livingston College, which has been cited as "the urban college that's the great experiment for the country," is located in wonderful, bucholic, pastoral, Camp Kilmer with lots of trees, and fields and streams running around it. You really have to go quite a way to see anything other than a college building. I don't blame the people that run Livingston. But it's the view of our Department of Higher Education and our legislators as to what an urban college is. Now all the urban kids supposedly come there for their courses about the urban environment. Livingston I can't pat on the back either, because their interpretation of new learning processes for Urban

residents was merely to hire radical instructors. They brought in somebody like Tom Hayden who did the same thing: he walked into the classroom, shut the door, and lectured them. He just lectured them about something different; he just gave them a different interpretation of American history. So, what's the big deal? It's the same structure. What's the new learning process? How has the urban kid developed? How is he able to show what he knows in any different form? I think that this kind of structure that we've set up in our colleges handicaps the whole situation, it prevents us from doing anything in the way of good urban education with urban residents.

But there's another strategy that can be taken towards attacking the institution, and one which works. There have been a couple of cases decided, one in California that's been recently decided and one in New Jersey, that kids in poverty areas do not receive the same amount of money for education and are being deprived of equal opportunity. One of the things that we've done was to get a lawyer and argued that before our State Supreme Court. We're looking at the movement of the colleges out of the cities and we're trying to determine if that's "deprivation of equal opportunity education" because of the low income of the population, when they have a much more difficult time getting access to Higher Education.

Doris, one of the studies which you cite in your book, indicated that when community colleges are located in the immediate neighborhood, there's a 50% increase in attendance. I'm very interested in that, and perhaps, I can end my presentation here and ask you to pick up on this point, and then have others join in the discussion.

Discussion

Holleb: The study was not one I did, but was cited in the book. The one you refer to may be the one done in Chicago by the planning task force for the City Colleges under Dr. Benjamin Willis. Other studies on access have been done since then, notably the one by Warren Willingham found in his book Free Access Higher Education. Actually, more recent studies, particularly one done in California, seem to call into question some of the previous conclusions about proximity to a college and attendance patterns. There are other barriers that must be overcome for the poor to utilize the opportunity that "free access" provides them. There are other factors involved that are vitally important: the design of the buildings (as you mentioned in your presentation) is very important, the utilization of space, so that there is a "visibility" about the college in the community, the "tone" that the college projects in its community relationships.

Previously, institutions have not given much attention to these things, and I am convinced that the results can be seen in the decline in enrollments, that in many cases the "flight to the suburbs" is the way the institutions are responding to the fractures in community relationships. Tied up with the crisis in community relations then are all the other issues of open admissions, recruitment, skill training, certification, credentialing. It raises the whole question, and I'm not at all sure what the answer is, as to how responsive can, or should, the colleges and universities be to the community? How much can we expect from an institution in the way of working with community groups? How do we move institutions to be more responsive?

I'm not sure there is any ready answer. I would caution on setting the expectations too high. Certainly the institutions of higher education as they now stand do not have the ability to solve the society's problems. Maybe they can help, but they must exhibit a very modest demeaner and low profile. Problems will get solved only with a lot of joint effort. Higher education is sitting on a lot of useful information, and can help in evaluating needs, analysis of issues, and even funding some joint projects. But we can only expect so much.

Chipman: Low profiles are tough, especially when the issues are so crucial. Sure, there is much that institutions of higher education can do, but one of the problems is that educators generally, the planners, the researchers, are all elitist. Joe pointed out right at the beginning of his remarks that the cities have changed, that the problems of the cities are now, very largely, the domain of minorities. And to most minority groups the educational establishment is anathema. And they've got lots of experience to back up the feeling--commission studies are funded, reports are produced, the Carnegie report is a good example, and everything goes on as usual.

Look at the issue of open admissions, which we've already mentioned several times this afternoon already. How many years have we had open admissions, and how many research reports have been produced on the effects? To what end? Admissions officers haven't learned a thing--they're still testing incoming students. And their conclusions: the kid who can't "articulate" is considered college "material"--the others need reading help.

I don't have any answers either. And I didn't find any in the Carnegie report that is supposed to be the focus of our discussion. I do know that the first and biggest mistake that can be made is to trust the federal government for leadership. Anyone who does that simply sells his soul and then just hopes that he has something left. I don't see much leadership in the colleges either. Community colleges have a great potential, I think, for developing leadership, but even so, all the administrators in community colleges have been trained at traditional (meaning elitist) institutions of higher education. The Board of Directors are the same kind of people. Too often, the institutions have "democratized" when no one wanted it, perhaps to keep the multitudes happy. I really don't know where we go from here, except to listen to some of the leadership out in the streets, people like Cy Purnell here in Chicago, who genuinely can articulate to educators some alternatives and realistic options.

Helleb: One of the problems in defining new programs and evolving new structures, to which Joe referred, is the very matter of declining enrollments. When the enrollment crunch is on, and revenues are threatened, no one is willing to take risks with new programs, no one is ready to innovate or take chances, yet it is precisely because times have left the old structures behind that the crisis has emerged. I think the institutions themselves will not respond, I think social change will occur only through students.

Lester: Oh, higher education will respond, but usually twenty years behind the times...

Chipman: And that simply points out how much a part of the society the higher education establishment is. It is society, and it can't move any faster than that. That is why we need other alternatives.

Moore: Ginny, you are involved in one of those alternatives. Joe mentioned earlier the development of Minnesota Metropolitan State College in St. Paul as part of the State College system that is an alternative institution for employed adults who work out their own pact with faculty advisors. We have in the works a new "Regents degree" option being developed in Illinois providing this option, called Lincoln State University. But you are involved in this already at Empire State College in New York, so maybe you could share with us something about that alternative.

Lester: Alright. At Empire State the average age in the student population is 36. We are located in Saratoga Springs but embrace the whole state, in so far as our students can live and work anywhere. We are involved in assessing the student's prior experience and translating that into educational terms. To do this we have evolved a thorough evaluation format, that allows us to assess the student's knowledge (including what he's learned in school), skills gained through employment, and the synthesis of these into a meaningful whole. Also, we are very much interested in basic communication skills. And we sit with a student to work out a learning agreement that encompasses our goals and his goals together. Also included in this assessment are the judgments of experts employed in the student's field to help us make judgments about the academic equivalences of experiences.

Polkinghorne: I'm very much in favor of these new alternatives, including the development of Empire State and the other new schools mentioned, but I think we have to be aware that these new alternatives are much more attractive to middle class, working people than to some of the others, the disinherited, the oppressed, that we began talking out. The poor, the Black, the "new students" in higher education, can't relate to these new approaches. Their preparation is deficient; they do not have the resources that we have; they do not fall into the category of "self-motivated" learners that these programs require. Besides, the Black students don't want anything to do with what looks like a "watered-down" course of study. They want to have the opportunity to try their hand at the old even if they fail.

Chipman: That's true enough, but we can't afford to let them fail. We must see to it that the resources they need to succeed are there for their support. And we must give attention to the end product, not just the opportunity. After all, the employers want the same the old certifications on the people they hire.

Dowling: To me, the end product is the crucial thing. Too many of the new programs still end up taking the poor folk and making them over like us, while the institution itself doesn't change. The question I have is whether or not those of us in higher education can learn anything from them in the process?

Chipman: Is it that we can't or we won't?

Andrews: Even if we do, I think we must be careful that we don't just put another nail in the same coffin. The whole economic structure we see crumbling, and I think that raises a whole host of other questions that we haven't even touched on yet.

Moore: Perhaps another way to put it is, if the central cities of our country are dying, what is it that we ought to be "relating" higher education to?

Holleb: The central cities are "dying" maybe, but I think it is more accurate to say they are "changing", and in some places they may even be "growing". I think our responsibilities must be seen as higher education's contribution to fashioning the "post-metropolitan settlements" of our civilization. New Jersey may be a case in point. We may need to redefine the whole urban-suburban spectrum, and talk more about the challenges before the whole metropolitan area, not just the central city.

Smith: Quite true that our terms need redefinition. The question is: Who is equipped to do it? The public schools can't do it, the professors on our campuses can't do it, Clark has said that we'd better not let the federal government do it. And the only thing one person can do is to work within one institution in one place and develop one program to meet a specific need at a particular time.

Polkinghorne: One thing that needs to happen is to build the incentives to do it, and that means reforming the entire reward structure of higher education which right now is oriented the other way. It will require new people moving in new redirections.

Holleb: One place I look for this to begin to happen is in and through the Community Colleges. That is where an awful lot of "new people" are coming through the door and I think we are just beginning to see the impact that they will make.

Moore: Community Colleges are the topic of our discussion tonight so I'm going to break this off here and we can pick up on the point later. Thank you all for the remarks so far.

SESSION TWO

Presentation by
E. Maynard Moore
Central YMCA Community College, Chicago, Ill.

Community Colleges and the Expansion of Educational Opportunity

Post-secondary education is in a stage of transition. The history of education in America has been one of expanding services and of enlarging concepts. This expansion is now balooning the dimensions of post-secondary education. It requires re-thinking of the purposes and objectives of post-secondary education, and a re-examination of programs and services. Among the new patterns of service that are emerging are community education programs at the college level.

At the turn of the century, there was almost universal acceptance of the idea that college education was intended only to train leaders, to prepare a relatively small group of intellectuals for a limited number of professions. Today the purposes of post-secondary education are interpreted in much broader social terms, to the point where the college experience is coming to be considered commonplace. Yet, the kind of training sought is of a wide variety, and the college experience offered is a far cry from that of our fathers and even the generation of the fifties. In keeping with the history of American education, the changes have been of an evolutionary nature, even though interspersed with periods of radical upheaval such as those seen across the land in the late sixties. Nevertheless, changes and reorganization of far-reaching consequences have quietly taken place as educational institutions have attempted to keep pace with the needs of the people.

In the United States, it is characteristic of the American people to put faith in education as a social instrument. It is part of the public philosophy that education contributes to the development of the individual and thus to the electorate as the foundation for democracy. It has been part of the heritage of the nation that education is more than training to earn a living, but includes as well the development of attitudes, habits, understandings, appreciations and ideals as well as knowledge and skills. As efforts have been made to broaden and strengthen the political and economic foundation of the American social order, similar efforts have been made in the educational sphere, with the ultimate goal of making a wide variety of educational programs available to a wide variety of people.

Whatever the efforts made, the results have been diverse and the goals only imperfectly achieved. Barriers still exist to post-secondary education. A number of studies over the years indicate that there still exists a close relationship between parental income and the amount of post-secondary education obtained by the children.[1]

---

[1] For representative studies, cf. George S. Counts, The Selective Character of American Postsecondary Education, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1922; Helen B. Goetsch, Parental Income and College Opportunities, Contributions to Education Series, No. 795, New York: Teacher's College, Columbia University, 1940; Elmo Roper, Factors Affecting the Admission of High School Seniors to College, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1949; Sewell and Shah, "Socio-economic Status, Intelligence, and the Attainment of Higher Education," Sociology of Education, Vol.40, Winter, 1967.

The combination of high family income, high IQ, and college admissions is a consistent pattern that has not yet been substantially modified, although efforts to broaden educational opportunity have made some headway.

Since the turn of the century, far-reaching trends in the arena of postsecondary education have come about, but many came so gradually that their significance is often overlooked. During the third quarter of the century, particularly, higher education has become increasingly popular, even necessary. The reasons have been closely related to advances in industry and business technology, and to social and economic developments, including a rising standard of living and expanding cultural interest. Simultaneously, the average age of entry into full-time employment has been steadily rising for several decades. The American high school graduate in the early years of this century had available only one kind of formal education, and there were only a few institutions in which he could find it. Today there is a great diversity of curricular offerings in a variety of formats for youth and the adult population as well--in evening colleges, business and technical institutes, proprietory schools, in university extension centers, and the new, comprehensive community colleges.

In the older days, there were considered to be four classes of workers. There were those in the unskilled labor group who were thought to need no formal education at all to do their jobs acceptably. Then there were the craftsmen who learn their trades on-the-job and who needed only a minimum of formal education. Third, there were the skilled tradesmen and businessmen who received in high school all the training they needed to compete successfully in the commercial world. Finally, there were professional people who required extended college training.

Today, however, the picture has changed. Many of those who have been manual laborers fifty years ago are employed as operatives or semi-skilled workers, running the machines which now do the jobs formerly done by hand. Added to these have been the thousands of additional jobs growing out of an expanded technology and growing economy. Many who were formerly craftsmen have joined the ranks of former laborers and are now moving into semi-skilled operative occupations.

These changes are pushing more and more of the labor force upward in the scale of educational needs, and a whole new category of employment opportunities has been created, that of technicians and para-professional workers. These changes in the economy and the demands of the labor market have come to mean new responsibilities for educational institutions. For technological advances in all industries have created needs for workers with broader fields of specialization and new experitse in a wide range of technical fields. Training is required for these workers beyond what was possible in secondary "industrial arts" courses, and of a different nature than possible to impart through the old apprenticeship methods of the craft-unions. These paraprofessionals are skilled technicians who fill interpretive and supervisory functions of all kinds between the managerial level and the operatives, on the one hand, and between the company and the buying public on the other. The need for technical skills grows every year, requiring paraprofessionals with special training and technical preparation secured on a postsecondary level of education.

Paraprofessionals and technicians require a kind of training that goes beyond the high school but does not quite encompass the necessity for a baccalaureate or graduate training common to the professions. Nor is

provision of technical "know-how" enough. Increasingly these persons are expected to display skills in human relations, a broad background for sound judgment, and some insight into the complexities of a modern urban world. These jobs are not performed in a social vacuum. In addition to the technical skills, a "general education" is required, commensurate with a growing conviction that intelligent, informed citizens are as vital to the functioning of a complex society as are highly trained leaders. As Diekhoff pointed out more than two decades ago: [2]

> The machine has replaced the Greek slave in our society. As the institution of slavery enabled the Athenian gentleman to devote himself to the management of his family and to civic affairs, ... our machines enable us to devote more and more of our time to the management of our families and to the affairs of state. We have an opportunity, if we do not refuse it, to become a nation of educated citizens and enlightened parents.

Koos, an early advocate of the junior college, encouraged this pattern of post secondary education by stressing three types of special services it could foster: (1) it could promote the consolidation of all appropriate preparatory work in the secondary school, (2) it could strengthen the goals of the public educational system by adding post-secondary places in education, and (3) it could relieve the pressures on the university and thus promote advanced writing and research.[3]

Eells, another educator in the "pioneer" days of junior college education, identified four functions of the junior college: the popularizing function, the preparatory function, the terminal function, the guidance function.[4]

Although only half a century old, the two year college has made significant contributions to the development of new concepts of post-secondary education. It has acted as a catalytic agent in stimulating other institutions of higher education to re-examine their objectives and results, and to be conscious of the need for new programs and services geared to changing individual, social and economic imperatives. It has made a contribution also toward the improvement of guidance functions and the development of other student-centered programs. Probably the most distinctive contribution, however, has been the creation within the educational ladder, of the concept of terminal education, both general and occupational, designed for those who do not, for whatever reason, wish to transfer later to a senior institution for advanced training.

---

2 John S. Diekhoff, Democracy's College, New York, Harper, 1950, p. 205.

3 Leonard Vincent Koos, II, The Junior College, Education Series No. 5, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1924, pp. 241, 381, 681.

4 Walter Crosby Eells, The Junior College, New York: Houghton-Mifflin, 1931, pp. xvii-xviii.

"Terminal" education is a relatively new concept that accompanied the development of the junior college. While the name "terminal" is inadequate or disliked by many educators, inasmuch as no educational program should "terminate" but should open more and broader avenues of learning, it is, nevertheless, commonly understood and accepted. "Terminal" education simply refers to a program that concludes an individual's formal schooling. The expression is usually applied to postsecondary programs combining direct occupational training with related general courses, usually two years in length with a diploma or certificate of achievement at the end. A special commission of the AAJC in 1940 applied the term to

> those courses specifically designed for students who do not want or need the standard four-year college course, but who wish in one or two years to gain an understanding of their intellectual, social, and civic environments, to explore several fields of work as an aid in making occupational choices, or to acquire vocational training which will lead to employment in semi-professional fields.[5]

The tremendous expansion of knowledge, particularly in the technological and applied fields, has accelerated the trend toward specialization in almost all occupations. It is increasingly impossible for workers to secure all the training they need for vocational competence at the same time that they gain a broad liberal education. Yet, the growth of modern scientific knowledge and the rapid technological advances which we are experiencing have accelerated the demand not only for workers with advanced technical skills but for those with a broader cultural understanding as well, with high levels of judgment, social discretion, and human perspective as well. Likewise, twentieth century living, with its complex industrial, political, and social organization, demands an increasingly sophisticated level of citizenship responsibilities and an expansion of learning experiences for a satisfying personal life. The situation calls for a combination of opportunities, including occupational training beyond secondary levels and a broad education for personal and social enrichment.

In comparatively recent years, the community college concept has been further expanding to embrace an orientation toward the needs of all people of the community, rather than primarily of those going on to universities. A considerable number of community colleges are becoming increasingly aware of community obligations and opportunities, and are striving to integrate their activities with those of their service area. They are moving in the direction of identifying themselves actively with the whole community and its various population segments.

Inherent to the community college concept is a concern with the educational needs of the people in its service area. Each institution is challenged to explore and determine its own educational objectives with those in the community it serves. Because it is an integral, working part of the community,

---

[5] American Association of Junior Colleges, Commission on Junior College Terminal Education, Journal of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars, XVI (October, 1940), pp. 63-64.

it is in a favorable position to study t e education needs thereof -- the requirements of both young and old for formal training and informal learning in general. The goal of the community college is not just to increase higher education's popularity and accessibility, but to provide a service which extends beyond the people traditionally targeted as "college potential." Whatever the form of its curriculum and program, the community college has as its dominant feature its intimate relation to the life of the community it serves.

In an early promotional piece published by the forerunner of the U.S. Office of Education, Kempfer and Wood referred to the community college as a "composite of educational opportunities" which included several characteristics:[6]

-- Services must be free as they are in other parts of the public school system; otherwise important population segments will be barred.

-- Service to the community is best assured through local control, preferably by the board of education.

-- A community college is essentially a comprehensive program of educational activities rather than an educational institution.

-- These activities must be sufficiently varied in content and method to serve the educational needs of the total adult community beyond the normal high school graduation age.

-- No educational prerequisites are specified, although qualifying courses may be expected for certain curricula.

-- Its doors are obviously wide open to the population, incorporating a broad program of adult education.

In Michigan, as far back as 1951, the State Department of Public Instruction said of the community college:

> All resources of the college should be welded into a unified service program. Basically important in adult programs are provisions for upgrading leadership competencies of civic, political, industrial, and social leaders; for programs of improvement of the cultural climate; for exploration of issues in public affairs; training in technological, occupational and related subjects in agriculture, business, industry, and trades; for family life education; and for all the multiple interests of individual citizens.

---

6 Homer Kempfer and William R. Wood, "The Community College--A Challenging Concept for You," School Life, XXXII, Washington, D.C.,Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, p. 129.

> This area of service of the community college is still so new that it has a special appeal to the pioneer and the trail blazer.[7]

The modern community-centered institution has come a long way from the exclusively college-preparatory one of a few years ago. The first qualification of a community college is servide. If a local college is to be a community institution, community situations, needs, and conditions should guide its procedure, in conjunction with educational theory, experience, and practice. A two-year community college, for example, cannot make preparation for the university its primary objective. Traditionally, institutions of higher learning have been particularly concerned with the intellectual development of the individual. More and more, however, all such institutions are coming to the point of view that cultural and social understanding and personal development in emotions and attitudes, training for successful personal and community living, are equally important both for the individual himself and for his prospective social contribution. Only when his personal relationships with home, family, friends, job, and community are satisfying can he learn to contribute most effectively.

The community college is in a preferred position to help implement the goals of better personal and community living which have been fairly well accepted in theory but not always achieved in practice. The development of understanding and responsibility in dealing with individual and group situations as they arise in everyday living is a vital responsibility of education in our democracy. Growth in the skills of social participation should be as carefully sought as growth in other individual capacities. Not all colleges will have the facilities and the resources to undertake all the types of training in which a community college might well engage, but each can make an important contribution to the success of its students' personal and social living. Education for life and citizenship goes hand in hand with the development of more realistic vocational goals and economic self-sufficiency.

It is a proper function of a primarily local, community institution, sensitive to grass roots needs, to serve its community in at least two other ways: direct public service and applied research. It is possible to extend the public service functions of higher education through a broader use of applied research and through more effective community utilization of specialists on college faculties. The community college can serve as an agent in the growth, development, and improvement of the community and the individuals in it. Its objectives might be to assist the community:

> to do its work
> to earn its wealth
> to improve its services
> to expand its culture
> to strengthen the family
> to widen occupational opportunity
> to open its horizon.

The community college can also make a significant contribution in that it provides another cultural center in the community and surrounding area, thus helping to create a richer and more attractive cultural climate which will

---

7 Adult Education and the Community College. Adult Education Leaflet No. 5. Lansing, Michigan: State Department of Public Instruction, 1951, p. 9.

increase the effectiveness and satisfactions of those living in the community and will help retain within it some of the talent and leadership which might otherwise be attracted elsewhere. As graduates of a local public college take their places in the community, as adults residing nearby continue their schooling in the college, and as the community comes to find it to be a fountainhead of community services of various kinds, it becomes increasingly a cultural center, a focal point of intellectual life, and its leavening influence increases. It may become a common interest for the people of the community, a source of common solidarity, a source of local pride.

The community college may likewise become the means by which citizens learn to recognize their civic responsibilities and their common interests in other activities and institutions. Its benefits are not restricted to its own students and their families nor even to those who actively support in other ways the college program. It enhances the value of other cultural institutions in the community and enables them to extend their services. A considerable amount of this influence must be coordinated with the goals of other community organizations. While the college sometimes will take the initiative and at other times plays a supportive role, many educational objectives may most effectively be obtained under bilateral or multilateral sponsorship. Not only is the task too big to be carried on by one institution alone -- through cooperation with other interested agencies and organizations, a larger portion of the community becomes involved, there is less duplication and wasted effort, and the results for all concerned are likely to be more satisfying.

Many community organizations have education as a main concern, but for most it is but one concern among many. The community college, which has education as its focal concern, stands ready, therefore, to make a unique contribution to the other service agencies in its area by making its expertise available to them. Usually, such community groups depend heavily, if not solely, on untrained, volunteer leadership. The community college may serve them well by developing training institutes and other plans for improving leadership competence. Groups which have a high annual leadership turnover often find themselves in need of help in developing skills in discussion leadership, parliamentary procedure, program planning, public speaking, and the like. Again, the community college may be of real service in helping enrich the educational content of the programs of such groups--and thereby benefit the community as well--through cooperative utilization of materials, equipment and facilities.

In every community there would need to be a sharing of resources, materials, leadership, and experience among all interested agencies in order to fortify, support, and to extend where possible the programs of educational organizations and agencies which are serving or have a chance to serve the public most acceptably. Through a common articulation of goals and purposes, it should be possible for each to find his own clear function which doesn't overlap, appropriate, or threaten the program of kindred agencies serving the community. There should be possible a common agreement between institutions as to their unique functions and potentialities in a total community program of adult education and similar services--a decision as to what each institution or agency can do best, without losing its own uniqueness but affirming it, to bring about cooperatively an improvement of its present methods for broadening and deepening the quality of life in the community.

One of the distinguishing characteristics of a community college is its recognition of responsibility for services to the entire population of

the community as well as those who enroll for its courses. The community college, in addition to serving the full-time academic and vocational formal education needs of people, can become the resource center for community leisure and recreational needs as well. It can provide space for both day and evening pursuit of avocational interests, from flower arranging to travel charter trips. It can offer counseling services. It can become a facility for community groups to produce plays. It can become a center for groups to plan programs for community welfare. It can offer its resources in factfinding and interpretation to help in the solving of community problems. It can project its services into community planning and improvement in cooperation with individuals and organizations of all types. In short, the community college has the resources to become a learning center for the community as a whole.

Community colleges also are in a position to do effective experimentation in developing off-campus civic and work experiences for college students. This may be a real contribution to all agencies of postsecondary education, as well as to the communities and individuals involved. One of the new styles in higher education since the student revolt of the sixties is to bring students out of the cloistered walls and to give them first-hand experience in the skills of civic and vocational living by designing all aspects of college education as an integral experience. Student participation in the community affairs of the local area through representation in civic groups and enterprises will develop insights into actual procedures and practices. Carefully guided work experiences will likewise develop more realistic ideas of the relationships that exist among employers and employees in an urban economy, and will be invaluable to the student in the formulation of more realistic vocational goals.

Relative to curriculum issues, a community college should provide credit level opportunities in a university parallel structure that will facilitate transfer for those wishing to go this route. This is a badly needed service for those for whom personal, geographic, or economic barriers may be barriers to immediate university matriculation. But in serving its community as a total resource/learning center, it can also, in cooperation with other agencies, attempt to meet other, legitimate postsecondary educational needs. In addition to the wideranging credit curriculum, its offerings may, for example, range from workshops in painting, dance and voice to play-writing and journalism and child psychology for young mothers (while their children are in the college-sponsored day care center, of course). In these service programs, the growth of persons is more important than the structure of the activities by which they grow. And questions of "academic respectability" are not appropriate to the concept and philosophy of the college whose objectives include the provision of integrated approaches to the development of high levels of personal growth and civic responsibility.

Closely allied with issues concerning curriculum are those which have to do with methods and techniques. At this point, also, the community college has not only the opportunity but the responsibility to pioneer new methods for bringing individuals into learning experiences. The conventional classroom approach perhaps has only one valid argument for use in certain credit programs: those students who do intend to transfer to senior institutions after one or two years at the community college, need to have some exposure to the rules of the classroom game, if they are to survive in the university environment later. Otherwise, the conventional classroom has little utility to recommend it. In fact, programs within classroom structures are often counter-productive to their stated purposes, and many unsophisticated community people, who otherwise have need for and interest in the programs the college offers, are easily "turned off" by the "course" approach to the

subject matter. A variety of other approaches are available: concerts, panels, workshops, demonstrations, forums, films, excursions, discussions, retreats, tutoring, homestudy, work-study, and a whole range of other "learning by doing" techniques.

Educators need to look toward teaming their resources with the talents of social scientists and other public servants whereby education can be harnassed toward the total improvement of the community. Research, study, planning, discussion, and action are all involved. The community college, if it will, can play a central role in these processes. Such a program of action-research, community planning, and the development of community services, while remote from the classroom, may become a comprehensive vehicle for learning nonetheless, and can provide a new means for community involvement for staff and students alike. A community college can make a real contribution to the cause of education by expanding its parameters of service with strategy and tactics in this area.

The scope of services sought in increasingly complex communities has meant new demands and responsibilities for post secondary institutions as they attempt to meet the emerging societal imperatives of a new day. Postsecondary institutions are increasingly accepting an opportunity and an obligation to use their resources and their facilities for research to help communities and larger areas in the solution of their problems. They are making enlarged educational opportunities available to the adults of the community, and are acting as training centers for community leaders and as consultation centers serving those seeking help in dealing with specific problems of community development. In a democratic society the community college should be a positive agent of social progress. An institution worthy of the support of a community owes it to that community to be a school of social action.

Presentation by

Charles Isaacs
Staten Island Community College
New York, New York

Open Access To What?

A PARABLE

Once upon a time, an ambassador in a faraway land was called back to the palace by a certain time. If he did not meet the deadline, he would be enslaved.

The ambassador immediately leaped on his donkey and sped off in the direction of home. But it was a long trip and on the way he got lost. He wandered aimlessly until he spotted a friendly person whom he asked for directions.

"My friend," he implored, "I need your help. How can I get to the Kingdom?"

The well-intentioned friend looked around, scratched his head, and thought about the problem. "Well," he finally responded, "if I were you, I wouldn't start from here."

The faculties of the new "open-access" educational institutions, especially the community colleges, have by now shown themselves largely innocent of the lesson contained in this little story. In CUNY, the prevalent image of the "good student" among its teachers remains much the same as it was when higher education was available only to the sheltered rich, the highly motivated petty-bourgeois, and an occasional token prodigy from the city's immigrant ghettoes. Proceeding from those standards and values, Open Admissions students are seen, almost by definition, as incompetent in mathematics, unsophisticated in politics, and deficient in skills of manipulating their language. While calling attention to the obvious, rationalizing resentment and pre-ordaining failure, such a view simply misses the point.

Illiteracy, of whatever kind, is a combination of belief, of attitude, and of social experience in social institutions, none of which is natural, inevitable, or inborn. The vast array of remedial courses presently offered generally ignore the socio-political problem with which they are actually dealing, thus dooming themselves to failure. They assume that the students are nothing more than abstract jumbles of tested inadequacies, having nothing to offer, nothing to build on, nothing to teach.

What do we find when we look at our students from a slightly different perspective? Almost all are of Third World or white working class background. Many are married and/or mothers and fathers. Many come to college after several years in the military, in prison, or in the subculture of the streets. Practically all

have worked to support themselves and most continue to do so. Only a small minority begin college at the age of 17-18. (The remark a student recently made to me regarding one of his teachers, "He keeps forgetting I'm 35 years old," is typical.) Junior high schools do not work for 12-year-olds; the employment of junior high school models in today's community college is simply ridiculous. We take a step in the right direction when we recognize that we are engaged in Education for Adults.

Once we accept the fact that our students are adults, we must understand that we, the credentialed "professionals," have much to learn from our students. No longer can the strict dichotomy between teacher and student be maintained, where the "the teacher teaches and the students are taught..., the teacher thinks and the students are thought about..., and the teacher is the subject of the learning process, while the pupils are mere objects."[1] The students must become teachers also, and the teachers students.

If we are to avoid the pitfall described in the parable, we must also reconsider the subject-matter, the "curriculum." We might begin by inviting the students to critically examine their role in the institutions which have determined their lives, dialogically, with us. As the dialectic engages the participants (given their origins and relationship to such categories as power and ownership, class and race), two dominant themes are likely to emerge: Oppression and Exploitation.

In exploring such themes, we should be careful not to separate knowledge from the act of knowing. Mao teaches that, "If you want

knowledge, you must take part in the practice of changing reality. If you want to know the taste of a pear, you must change the pear by eating it..."[2] Having begun to demystify the roots of exploitation and oppression, we must invite our students to act on this new knowledge, and we must be prepared to act with them.

The college campus then becomes the city itself, each institution within it an arena for thought and action. Problems presented for investigation might include the rationalization of casual murder in municipal hospitals; the destruction of the mind in ghetto schools; the monopolization of culture for the rich in tax-supported cultural institutions; the corruption of city government; even the organization, structure of power, and social function of our own colleges.

Having transcended the dichotomy between the campus and the city, we might go a step further. We might extend our direct constituency beyond those who can leave their homes and jobs for a semester, a week, or a half-day at a time. We might offer to share our credit-granting monopoly with unions, consumer groups, community organizations. We might meet with our classes where the people of the city live and die: in homes, factories, prisons, office buildings, storefront community centers. We can make the college a part of the community, rather than the community a part of the college, thus reversing the pedagogical imperialism which now links the university fortress to its surroundings.

Conventional programs for educational reform-from-above typically keep their true goals secret. A program such as this one must openly confront the hidden agenda of the university, and

announce its own goals. It will not exist to provide industry with free job training, although it may develop usable skills among its participants, as well as the political consciousness to turn such skills to their own advantage. It will not exist to disguise skyrocketing unemployment, but rather to demystify it, to discover and uproot its origins. It will not exist to socialize docile workers and passive consumers, but to reconstruct the essential dialectic of reflection and action in the students' own interests. To the fundamental question, "Education for what?", we might answer with Paulo Freire's definition of conscientización: "...Critical self-insertion in a demythologized reality."[3]

The recognition of our students as human beings, and as adults, and of their right to a voice, has consequences for us as well as for them. The determination that they might transcend the limits placed on them by society, based on class and race, has consequences for us as well as for them. The decision we make to no longer separate learning from life also has consequences. For those of us relatively secure in the womb of credentials, profession, salary, this means taking risks. Demystification of the learning process threatens our omnipotence in the classroom. Engagement in the life of the city threatens our insulation from social pressures. Most of all, the making of common cause with the long-range self-interests of our students may threaten our jobs. We should be prepared to take such risks.

But have we really any choice? How many of us feel fulfilled as teachers facing masses of blank faces? How many of us are proud of the fact that the life-chances of our students remain pretty much

the same, even though they have gone out of their way to register for college and spend time on campus, thus justifying our appropriation of a share of their taxes? How many of us are comfortable with the prevalent trend in faculty unionism, which increasingly defines our interests in opposition to those of the students?

The alternative is simple. Let us join hands with those who represent the future, and make history together.

NOTES

[1]Paulo Freire: Pedagogy of the Oppressed (New York: Herder & Herder; 1970), p. 59.

[2]Mao Tse-tung: On Practice (Peking: Foreign Languages Press; 1966), p. 7.

[3]Paulo Freire: Cultural Action for Freedom (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Educational Review; 1970), pp. 21-22.

Discussion

Dowling: Charlie, I like your remarks about making the college part of the community, but where in this process is the responsibility to engage in curriculum reform?

Isaacs: We must do the curriculum evaluation, in my view, within a historical context. Where have we been, where are we now, where are we going? The community focus in most institutions is "second class" and is rightfully rejected by most minorities who have been riding second class all their lives. If community education is at the core of the curriculum, it would be something different. Right now, its hardly anything more except education for wage slavery.

Rosser: Another way to put it might be that the student can learn best by getting out of school.

Polkinghorne: You know, liberal arts means gaining some distance from the specific task. Even the liberal arts can be made relevant to the problems of the cities, if that's where we are. And, on the other hand, the vocational and career education programs are something more than the technical, or at least should be. There is a mystery there too. Whatever the format of the education, how do we get at the human values...

Smith: One's peers can often articulate this better than the teacher.

Rosser: Which brings up the point about teacher preparation again. Particularly in the community colleges where most students work, have families, and commute to school, it is most often the teacher who is the only one not engaged in any "action" situation. That is, the students have all the perspective on the course material, while the only point of reference for the teacher is the four walls of the classroom, which hems one in. Only the teacher "hides out" full time. How many teachers of social work theory also carry a case load, for example? I think we need to connect this matter of experience assessment at both ends.

Isaacs: The administration is no better. I think every college administrator ought to spend one week as a secretary and find out what it's like.

Rosser: My only point is that perspective, the clarity that comes with learning, comes out of involvement.

Andrews: That, it seems to me, is the good thing about skills training. It forces one into a situation of practical application to focus the learning.

Isaacs: But it has to be more than the career education we now have. The whole trouble with "terminal" educational programs that Maynard talked about is that they really are terminal.

Smith: Yes, we have to keep in mind the goals of the students, too. How many students come to us in order to get their lives enriched? None, or practically none. Reversing roles with the secretary can be helpful in learning some things, but that is not the way to learn to type. People have a tendency to learn things when they need to learn.

Lester: We've sort of solved the problem that Noreen first mentioned by doing away with the curriculum. We don't have a curriculum. A student in our program has a full-time mentor, who helps him define the contract to accomplish the goals that he himself sets. Skills are learned and perspective gained and it's all then brought back to the mentor. There are written guidelines, modules and evaluative questions, but its hard to get this done without getting strung out.

Moore: The thing I like about the Empire State model and others like it is that it really does emphasize, not just "learning by doing", but "learning through caring". The human dimension is right at the core and the whole learning process is focused on the student and his need rather than the needs of the institution to keep up enrollments or whatever.

Rosser: I'm trying to fit these new learning styles into the community college context which is the one I'm functioning in. At least at the college where I teach, the students don't come to class to learn--they're there for very practical ends, to keep a work-study job or to get a certificate or a degree for a better job. And it seems to me that what we need to do is make the student into a subject, not an object. This means dealing with the strengths of the poor, and enhancing their ability to function in an urban world and better manipulate their environment for their own ends as subjects.

Andrews: But many people, and particularly our students, have to be shown that they can do this. When they come to us they aren't capable of making all the decisions required. That's why we have the Special Services programs for the disadvantaged and the intensive work in our interdisciplinary seminars. A whole lot of nurturing needs to take place.

Smith: Still, we have to keep in mind the things they need in order to be functional in society when they get out.

SESSION THREE

"New Responses, New Challenges for Higher Education"

Presentation by

Leander Jones
Producer, TV College
City Colleges of Chicago

My topic is listed as "Visual Literacy." I don't know what it means to you but it mainly means that, in my experience, I come in contact with a lot of young people that don't do too much reading. But they can pick up a lot of experiences around them by just checking them out - looking at them. They're doing a lot of watching television, and of movies. So, that's what I'm talking about: How we can improve the effectiveness of those media and how we can improve the response of the viewers.

Right now I'm a television producer and director, and maybe this is one of the reasons why I'm thinking about that. I'm also a theatre producer, but I haven't had time recently to do much in the theatre, because I've been doing so much in television and also on my project. I'll give you a little recap of my project, of what I'm trying to do and where I'm trying to go with it. Then, I'll open up for questions.

I had a theatre on 35th St.; it has the tag of being a very rough neighborhood, but it isn't rough anymore, because there's nobody down there. You'll find a few dope addicts, now and then, standing on the corner, but by and large, it's rather torn down. The Theatre was on Michigan Ave. It was called the Louis Theatre, named after Joe Louis. It was a big ragged building when we took it, and it stayed ragged throughout our sojourn there. It was also cold. We took it in the winter, so we had very few members of the audience. We usually had more people on stage (participants) than we did in the audience, unless we put forth an effort and got NYC kids to come. The fact that the young people came and wanted to get something from us, from the standpoint of participating in the theatre experience, started me to thinking that this would be an effective vehicle for bringing about a change of awareness, bringing about better perception, in fact, bringing about education.

Before that, I had taught in High School for a long time, about 10 years, as a matter of fact. It didn't seem like High School at all; I don't know what name to give it, because it certainly didn't seem like elementary school either. It seemed like something without a name. It was fantastic. They did their thing and you did yours. Different teachers had different problems because they had different approaches to this whole idea of education. It seems that the administration figured that if the room was quiet you were doing something; you were a marvelous teacher, if you kept them quiet. It depended on the people you had though. Because the fact that it was quiet early in the morning was my biggest problem. I would come in the room and my problem was trying to get them to open up. They would come in the classroom, sit down and start nodding. I had no trouble keeping them quiet. I was about the only one in there making any noise! They seemed to have the attitude that if you don't bother me, I won't bother you; and that's it. I wasn't in to that 'nod thing' then - but I don't think they were doing that heroin bit on me. Still, some of them would come in and just sit there. So, I started the theatre bit there. I'd say "OK, everybody up"; and we'd just run around the room and do something (you know) to get your motor running. We would run around the room and do all kinds of stuff. I would run up here and write on

that board and I would have them write on the board. The supervisors would come in the room and they didn't know what the hell was going on in there.

I started thinking when I saw these young people coming into the theatre, really grappling with problems facing them: their own personal problems and trying to find some answers in the art form and theatre and really trying to promote themselves. I had a fair amount of success with two or three of them. One young fellow who was a high school graduate - he's learned the knack (or he already had it) of analyzing plays. He never did learn how to project one. But he learned enough about it to teach other people; he could relate to them very well. So, we started going in that direction. We started reading poetry and we started this dance kind of thing. We started this body language business before I even heard that term, because we see a lot of that on the street.

And this whole idea of "visual literacy" came to me. If we break away from the printed page and started using everything in the environment as educational tools, we would get a lot further, I think. I remember these catchy commercials such as "Winston tastes good, like a cigarette should" and how the old fools jumped on the "like". I bet 95% of the people didn't know what the hell they were talking about. "You can't use like as a preposition" - what's a preposition? The thing sold cigarettes; it went from nothing to #1. So, there must be something to this. The more I started thinking about that and started checking into it, and reading studies about the television-watching habits of the American populace - I found this could be a very effective media. Everybody said it could be, but it wasn't being, and I thought I could help it be. So, I went and got a degree in Radio & Television - and found out I could not do a damn thing.

It's like turning a battleship around: It takes a whole lot of room and a whole lot of time. I don't know whether I can afford either. So, when I heard about the UGS program, I thought it was a very fascinating thing. I thought I could do what I was doing with this community theatre and get somebody to certify it for me, check with people who were doing some exciting things. Then, when I started looking at my community and this Louis Theatre I just told you about, I discovered that it was no longer there as a theatre. A church group bought it out. So, I was now without a house and without a house it's hard to do theatre. We thought about guerilla theatre, doing it in the street, but that is a good way to get hit on the head.

What can I do? That's the question. How can I get this thing going? So, I hit upon the notion that the community, part of our community, has been removed and I wondered where they all were. Where were all these young men? Well, I looked out there, at Blackstone Ranger territory, where I taught for awhile, and there was one thing that struck me as rather peculiar. There was a disproportionate number of girls there and I wondered, where were all the boys. They were locked up, and I started looking at that business of being locked up. That is where I ought to be, where they are. So, I checked with some prison authorities. At first I thought about going to Stateville, but in thinking about that and talking with some of the officials, I decided against Stateville, in favor of Pontiac, which is further down the road, about 100 miles. It's between here and Springfield, sort of near Bloomington. It's a maximum security institution for young fellows. The mean age is suppose to be 19, although I don't know how they arrived at that, because I know a whole lot of dudes there who are 24 and 25 and 26. As a matter of fact, most of them are about that age. But, admittedly, I'm just seeing the top, because I'm doing a college level program. Well, I went down there and the man welcomed it. We already had a TV

college. TV college is where I work. When I produce and direct, I do it for TV college which is part of the City Colleges of Chicago; and they give college credit for these programs that we are producing. You can get an A.A. degree, simply by looking at the courses on TV and passing the tests. It takes you a while, but if you are patient enough and wait around enough, you can get the A.A. degree. And since they have lots of time down there in the penitentiary, they can wait around for it. I went down there and told them that a "face-to-face presence" would improve the whole educational set-up and they agreed with that.

I also had a radio program at the time and they all liked that. I don't think they ever heard it, but they liked it, liked the idea anyhow. The warden is a very progressive-minded man; I don't think he's going to be there very long for that very reason, and his assistant also. They are very fine people. They are still there; they weathered two storms. When I first started, they had a minor disturbance out there, and I had to delay my entry. They said it was "gang-related", the same thing I was talking about. The Blackstone Rangers and the Disciples decided they were going to have a bash right there on the prison grounds. So, they locked them up and locked me out, for a couple of months. Then later I got started and it rolled up until last December. They did it again. One guy killed another, as a matter of fact, this time. And he, in turn, died; it was a stabbing; they stabbed him. One died immediately and one died the next night. And I got locked out again. By virtue of the fact, they got locked in. I just returned yesterday. They just readmitted me and the rest of the program.

Well, during the first lull, when I first talked to them, they told me that some people had already started Black Studies programs out of the DuSable Museum of Afro-American History here in Chicago. I already knew Marvin Burroughs who runs that and most of the people who participate in it. When they had that break, I contacted them and they said, "Yeah, we've been down there; we would like to go back down there." Then Lewis College, a Catholic College in Lockport, decided they would like to get involved in some of the things that I had been talking with the prison officials about. They had a Division of Community Affairs and a Dean of Continuing Education and they thought this would be an excellent opportunity to extend their programs of adult education. So, they talked with me and with the DuSable Museum and they just incorporated us, made us faculty members.

What I'm doing now down there is Theatre Arts and Broadcasting Skills. Now that might sound very unusual for convicts to be working on, but what the hell, they dig it, for a number of reasons. The main appeal is this area of expressing themselves. I wanted them to become expressive. That is very fundamental to getting out of there. If they can make an excellent presentation to the parole board, their chances of getting out are increased. It has its appeal right there. Then after they get out. After talking about it with them and thinking about it for a while, I thought I might be performing a valuable service to them and a hell of a disservice to you, because many of them are in there on what you call "confidence activity". And all they need is to speak a little bit better, and they will be fantastic con men. That came to me. But, that's one of the risks that we're going to have to take, I'm afraid.

Actually, what I'm doing is to bring about an attitudinal change. I use theatre to increase self-discipline, self-awareness, self-confidence and all of those high-sounding things that all the psychologists and sociologists throw at you all the time. And, also the content, because we get into this whole area of Urban Studies, Black Studies, and so forth,

because I let them, I encourage them, to pick their own content, and also to originate it. Just about all the people in prison figure that everybody is interested in their story. They are going to write that autobiography to end all biographies. And, they fancy themselves as poets. So, I encourage that individual, original contribution. And, another aspect of the program that I think is very valuable is the "pass along". Those that are in it, can "pass along" to others and get them thinking about atitudinal changes and so forth. See, the over-riding factor in a penitentiary is getting the hell out. That's what you want to do. You want to get out. But, then you have to think beyond that. And, I'm trying to get them to think about "what the hell are you going to do, when you get out." The statistics show that most of them come right back, because they will not have learned a damn thing while they were down there, except more petty criminal activities.

Another thing, I started them to thinking about themselves, because they work on themselves all the time. "You see, you're not successful, even at being a criminal, because if you were, you wouldn't be in here, because we've got thousands of criminals walking the street." So, they started to think about things like that. And you can do it without creating too much of an emotional imbalance if you do it in an art form. If you do it artistically and start them to start thinking about this detachment, they can withdraw from themselves and see themselves as the "other". "It's not really me that he's talking about" (that's how they come on at first): "he's talking about somebody else." And pretty soon that "somebody else" is right there: "that dude did that". Then they turn around and say, "Hey, wait a minute--he's talking about me." I tell you, I had one dude he was very successful - I don't credit myself, he was successful when I got there. He had his A.A. degree and all; and he was alright. But, he and I had lots of talks, because I had him as sort of my organizer because I didn't have time to be taking roll and all that. You'd be surprised at the number of absences. I'd ask, "Where were you?" "Oh, I was in the hole." "Oh, I was sick." I had the same damn thing that I had over here in school, you know. So, he was sort of my organizer and he would get them in there and we would have talks from time to time.

I think there is a lot of waste, waste of potential, waste of human resources, waste of everything in the penitentiary. Now, my humble project is not to destroy the whole penitentiary system, but it is to get the community aware of what's going on down there. So, I usually go out into the community and make speeches in the churches and all. And, I usually get very hostile and negative reactions because most of the people that I'm talking to have just been ripped off - they usually know somebody who has just been raped. So, they usually start asking all those questions. Also, on the radio, a man named Wesley South has a program called Hotline, and I was on that program one evening and it was really hot that night too.

So along with my community involvement, I was talking about, I would like to see more people who can really make decisions go down there and make an impact on other people, such as state representatives and state senators. I would also like to see some judges down there to see what they send them to. I just talked to Judge Leyton; he's one of the black judges and he was a criminal lawyer before. Leyton said he's not afraid of some of the people he sent down when he was judge, he's scared of some of those people he defended when he was an attorney. Those are the ones that you have to watch out for.

I told you I wasn't going to tell you how I got started in this prison thing but in order to bring Judge Leyton in, I may have to tell you. I'm

something of a chess player. And, at Stateville, since I couldn't do a whole education thing there, I just decided I would do a part of it, I would do a chess thing there. Again, I'm dealing with a very limited number of people. And I realize that when I'm talking about theatre, I'm dealing with a very limited number of people. But in the case of the theatre, the spill-over effect is quite broad, it can encompass very large numbers of people. But in chess that's not so. I think it's a very rewarding experience, and it is also very educational. So, we do our chess thing down there, and I've gotten Judge Leyton to go down there. I just called them. I've got the open door, I can come down anytime that I want to. The last time the Judge was there he played simultaneous exhibitions, he played 11 games and lost four games. Well, if you're playing simultaneous exhibitions I told him to line up 25 and I would take 10 and let him take 15. And I'll take the weaker 10 and let him take the stronger 15. He's probably going to lose some games again, and I'm probably going to lose some too. So, in Stateville I've got my chess thing. They want me to increase that. They want me to bring in therapy. There is so much you can do in the penitentiary. In fact, there is almost no end to what you can do in the penitentiary. But its another thing altogether getting the community to see that this person is not the pariah that you think he is. I was talking to a young fellow, he's a brilliant young fellow, he's about to get his B.A., he's going to get it this spring. He's in for rape. I normally don't ask people what they're in for, they usually volunteer this information. He's such a tall, handsome fellow, you know. "What the hell are you doing raping somebody." He said he couldn't cope with the environment. And another thing--he raped a white girl. I asked him if it was a girl or woman. She was 18. He was 17. She was not known to him. She was white. But he is half white--his mother is white. And I guess that was what he meant about his not being able to cope with his environment. White mama, black daddy, black neighborhood, white girls all around. He went in when he was 17 and he's 26 now. He's not thinking about getting out. Just about everybody else is, talking and writing the parole board and so forth. He never has. He's not eligible. He hasn't served his minimum yet. I don't know what's going to happen as far as his getting out. So, he gets all the education he can. He's got a discussion group called: "Discussion Unlimited". He's all into this television and radio thing: How to be interviewed properly, and how to conduct an interview. In my broadcast I get into that: "Interview Information", the types of things that they can really handle and that they can relate to. Sometimes we combine the two, and they can assume a character, Jesse Jackson on radio, and they become Jesse. "OK, you're the man from CBS; show me CBS, you can't come slouching in here like that, you've got to be CBS." I get a kick out of it and they get a kick out of it. And it can carry over into their everyday behavior. And it does carry over; the warden tells me about it. And the other aspect of it is that they have to work on their own. They have to work on the material that I give them and they have to develop their own material after a while. They have to carry the program and then they have to show me what they've done, after they've done it.

I haven't said very much about television except to say that we didn't have the equipment. So, we had to practice on the dummy equipment, doing the kinds of things that I just mentioned. They can be themselves and be a news commentator and develop five minute pieces from magazines, newspapers and so forth; or they can assume the identity of a top news interviewer and another one can assume the identity. "OK you're down at the Indianapolis 500" (they all like fast cars and you can easily get something started on that). They're sports figures and they're working on the cars, and somebody comes up and interviews him. In the theatre part of it: "OK, this is a beautiful day outside, alright; but it's been raining all last week and you haven't had time, you haven't had a chance to check out your car. This is the first beautiful day you've had. You want to run around that track. But,

here comes the man from NBC. Now you don't want to be rude to the man from NBC, you want to shine on NBC. On the one hand you've got to get in that damn car, and run around on the track; but on the other hand you've got to keep your public pacified and you've got to keep your name publicized and your picture in the paper." So, they've got this dilemma and they have to play this, see. And this is an example of the kinds of things we do in the theatre. We try to create a little tension and have a little conflict and have it so that it does not wind up in violence.

I usually give them one, then I'd say, "alright, you do one." At first invariably, they would start off in a poolroom and they would be shooting and somebody would either get knifed, choked, hit with a cue ball or something. And I said, "Wait a minute; hell, this is supposed to be changing attitudes, not repeating the same kind of shit you were doing. Alright, you can show me that kind of thing, but don't use violence as a solution to all your problems; if you're going to do that, then I'm going home." So, they started getting a bit better. And sometimes I would do far-fetched ones, such as: we'd line up here at the table and I would get some dude and say "OK, you get on the table, and OK you, you're the chief surgeon there. Wash your hands and put on your gloves. You, you do the oxygen bit. You, you're his assistant there. OK, he's been shot in the abdomen." The first time I used that word they were reaching at their throats, what the hell! So, we developed a little vocabulary in there too. "He's got a bullet lodged somewhere in his spine and you're going to get it out." And they would wipe his brow. They'd get a fantastic amount of people coming to the window: "Hey, they're operating on this cat". This is strictly mime, using the body and stuff. And then I'd give them one that could call in their experience since I didn't expect to be producing any surgeons down there. "This is Sylvania, the back room at Sylvania. We've got a whole lot of TV's here, see, and you're going to be soldering and stuff." And this is called, in the jargon: "manipulation of small objects". And they have to let us see that small object, let us see the soldering iron; they go up there and touch it. And we have a bunch of people up there, you know, on our assembly line.

We do a lot of fantasy kinds of things and then again we try to get some real-life kinds of things. Take the job interview, for instance, and the counseling. Here you have to have some activity going on. They have to pass out pamphlets, booklets, and so forth. This guy goes and gets them and the other guy thumbs through them and all. And it is really a fantastic learning experience. I know they get something out of it because they can do it the next time. Next time, they do that and I just sit there. First time they do it, I coach them throughout. Next time I just say: "job interview" and they go through and they set it up. And we critique and ask a lot of "how do you feel, how did you feel?" So they not only have to act out a lot of things but then talk about it and reflect on it later. Right now, I guess I'm describing my project to you. Right now I'm about ready to go into my Project of Excellence and it's going to be a demonstration tape. I intend to take it around the country. As an outgrowth to this, some other people have started working on this. I've been in UGS since '71 and we're now talking about a "University Behind Walls" to go with University Without Walls. On the other hand, we might not get it going because we've got a lot of people who have said: "it's got to be destroyed," you know, the whole prison system, and we'd be playing games and all that kind of stuff if we do that. But on the other hand, someone would say that that's revolutionary. So that's one of the things we started thinking about doing. We've had one conference on that and several mini-conferences, and something might come of it. If this tape that I'm talking about is as good as I want it to be, it will show the direction that this can take.

* * * * * *

Discussion

Moore: Thank you, Leander. Let's open this up now for some comments, starting with Dr. William Charland, the Director of the University Without Walls program at Chicago State University. Bill, you've got a couple of UWW students doing the "Behind Walls" things, don't you? Why don't you begin the discussion response and we'll open it up from there.

Charland: I don't know to what extent this will be a response, but I'll give my opinion. Let me draw a great generalization that you may want to respond to and think about. If not, then others can share issues that are important to them. I think this has some reference, Leander, to some of the things you were saying.

In my experience with University Without Walls today and an earlier experience in more traditional higher education, it seems to me that education today and innovative education generally is involved in a kind of basic contradiction, a dichotomy at any rate, between two desired outcomes. I'm going to try to pin that down a little bit because this is a notion that I'm intrigued with even though I haven't really brought it down to specific terms.

The two desired outcomes, or educational values, seem to be: creativity on the one hand and competence on the other. And one way to reflect on this is for each of us to recall the last time that we felt ourselves to be rather fully creative in our lives: something that we did, experienced, participated in, that really fostered and expressed our creativity. And then think back also in the recent past on the time when we felt most competent. Are these moments or these sides of ourselves necessarily in conflict? Are they ever mutually supportive? I think that education, in one degree or another, tries to foster each side of the person and often does it in a rather un-coordinated fashion.

It also seems to me that educational institutions which operate at various class levels in our society (according to their investment in a particular social class) tend to become more interested in the nurturing of creativity on the one hand or competence on the other. Without getting into too elaborate a discussion of social class in our society, let's just make a basic distinction: We live essentially in a technocratic society--a favorite thesis of Gibson Winter--a technocracy which "manages" life to a high degree. We can distinguish, I think, between those who control that technology and those who are subservient to it. Another way to talk about this is the distinction between the "overculture" which controls the technology and the "underculture" which is controlled by it.

Education, I think, has some paradoxical relationships to that class distinction. It seems to me that at the topmost strata of the society, the primary educational value is creativity. I say this having spent several years on the faculty and staff at Lake Forest College, a traditional, single-class, upper class institution on Chicago's North Shore. At Lake Forest, as at the private preparatory schools in the surrounding communities, there is a tremendous investment in creativity, and very little concern with the development of specific skills or competencies.

Prior to that I was on the staff of Clark College, a small, principally black, school in the ghetto of Atlanta, where the educational values were very different. I can never forget the motto at Clark College: "Culture for Service". Not culture for culture or for self-expression, but culture for service. There it was an unquestioned value, with fundamental Puritannical origins, that was reflected in the style and life of the school.

University Without Walls is in an interesting position, since the schools are so diverse: Skidmore, Goddard, Antioch, schools charging $2,000 a year in tuition, and then you have Minnesota, Chicago State, and Staten Island Community College charging no more than $400, and serving a very different clientele. I find that even in our local group (we have 100 students) we have only about ten who are into something that I would label "creative" as over against a more traditional course of study, for the other 90 per cent. This is not to say that the 90 per cent aren't the intellectual equals of the minority 10 per cent, but simply that they are engaged in pursuits that have as a goal making them master technicians in our society.

Now it seems to me that we have a third alternative, and this, as I see it, is really the challenge of the UWW programs across the country: and that is merging, combining, these two approaches to learning. This is the question before us: Can creativity and competence be combined? We spend most of our time with the 90 per cent, who are often highly competent, established in a career based very much on innate ability, but who very much need a credential. The trick is to help people move toward a superior level of competence, but to do so through a life-enhancing style. When we are successful in doing this, in combining these two approaches in the life of an individual, then I believe we come very close to the main purpose of education.

Just one final footnote: I think we all need to be more sensitive to the way these values appear and are reflected in our curricular structures and educational activities. I know that there is a high level of creativity cherished by the upper strata of society, an investment in creativity per se where the economic necessity demands are not felt. But where we often get seduced, is in the translation of this education-enhancing style into the lowest social strata which ignores the inherent richness of the practical dimensions of life-objectives in the lower class.

The dilemma I'm referring to is pointed up in the absurdity of the test situation which tries to measure the competence of teachers through an exam. The assumption is that the test can demonstrate both creativity and competence, while it ignores the social situation which often will thwart both. The economic situation makes the outcome of the test for the prospective teacher very important, and some are rewarded with jobs and promotions; whereas there are others who "fail the test" yet who could write a radical critique of the test and the subject matter out of their own experience in a social situation that demands the combination of the highest levels of both creativity and competence. Somehow we need to devise an alternative for those who are faced with dealing with this absurd situation and system.

Jones: Another good example of the absurdities that our educational system gets into, at some schools in the South, they teach everybody in English classes to-talk-like-this. They-make-them-shed-all-of-their-na-tu-ral-speech-pat-terns-and-speak-cor-rect-ly. They-strip-an-y-sem-blance-of-cre-a-ti-vi-ty-by-fit-ting-the-stu-dent-in-to-a-mold. When the fact of the matter is that these students have a very rich language that comes out of their experience.

Moore: A similar thing happens in many schools, not just in the South, but many where recent years have seen admission policies "open up" to permit the so-called "disadvantaged learner" a college opportunity. The admission policies have changed but the expectations have not. The result is that the "new student" in higher education has a double-disadvantage because the college life style and curriculum is all bound up with the prevailing middle-class culture. Thus, the new students are required to shed their old habits and much of their culture and compete with suburban kids on alien turf, as it were,

without much preparation and hardly any external resources. Another aspect of this is the age barrier, not just the socio-economic distinctions. What I mean is that colleges today, even in the face of declining enrollments, continue an "off-to-college" motif geared to the 18 to 23 year old, and ignore the growing number of adults expressing new interests in learning but coming out of another life-style, including full-time employment, that will not permit "taking off for college." The result is that an awful lot of creativity and talent is being wasted, even among those who do come.

Charland: The most undesirable option is that of training a person out of his culture, but another undesirable option, it seems to me, is that of simply affirming, uncritically, the language inherent to the background of the student. Of these two, I would prefer the latter, but when we do this, it gets us into trouble with the technocracy. And, when the students leave college and come face to face with the "overculture", they are handicapped because they can't speak the language of the market-place. They will have a degree, but will be in real trouble trying to survive and succeed. We have to affirm their native skills, including the street skills that our students bring to us, but we have to provide them a language to operate in the other world too. A model for us, I think, is the old and familiar "junior year abroad" kind of thing in the traditional liberal arts colleges, where the student is lifted bodily out of the college setting and thrust into, immersed in, another strange culture, and in this sense truly becomes "bi-lingual". A similar demand is upon us today, particularly with our minority students: not training them out of their own culture, but requiring them to leave it behind for a while, immersing them in a new world where they learn anew how to swim, and end up culturally and linguistically competent in both.

Moore: The external degree granting programs, oddly enough, are now facing the opposite sort of problem. Rather than getting students out into the world, these programs are taking students who are immersed in the day-to-day work activities and trying to provide an experience and setting for them to reflect on their activities in a meaningful way. Ginny, perhaps you could share with us something of your experience at Empire State College on this problem.

Lester: What I want to respond to, Maynard, is that in the talk about "assessment of prior experience" the key is the distinction between the credentialing agency and the educational institution. We are not a credentialing agency. We assess that prior experience, including the present job being held, and we say, "okay, what else seems to be missing?" We do the assessment in terms of the prior experience in the context of our institutional goals, the goals being knowledge, skills, basic communication abilities, synthesis, analysis. So that if the musician comes and can play the notes but he can't improvise, or can't read music or compose, then it becomes clear that those are the things that are missing; and when we see what's missing, then we say "that's the amount of time you have to spend with us, because our graduates can do each one of these things." We say that this is part of our institutional objectives, and if you join us, they must become yours. We have to agree on the objectives, and sign a contract for a program relative to the achievement of these goals. So that when competency is achieved, it is achieved in these areas that we have defined together.

Charland: You seem to be saying, then, that you are not very much concerned with creativity...

Lester: No, I think we are because we are very much concerned with what happens in the individual's life after he leaves us...

Smith: Yet you are a credentialing agency, because you do give the degree. Which means to me that we've drawn the distinction too firmly between creativity and competence. There is a difference, but it gets blurred at times.

Internally you do not view yourself as a credentialing agency, but you are concerned with developing skills, and sometimes it may be a "creative skill" that's missing. On the other hand it may be a very technical kind of skill. And there are skills in creativity too, so I don't think creativity and competence need be in conflict.

I don't want to prolong the discussion about creativity, because first of all I don't really know what creativity is. I do know that for me to produce a good teacher, I want to be able to turn the screws to produce. Because given the demands of some of the teaching situations, I want to be able to predict that when the pressure is on, one of only about two or three different kinds of behavior will occur. Yet, if the alternatives are limited to the traditional three or four patterns of behavior, nothing is going to change very much in schools. Somehow we have to "build in" or "build up" the creative attitude because, with all the experimental programs in higher education, no one yet really knows what the hell it is that makes us learn. We don't even know the biological basis for learning...

Jones: It's a very subjective area. Learning can be measured only after it has been achieved, but not too much is known about how it happens. On the other hand we can measure competence and we know how to teach certain skills, and that's why we certify the end product. But when you talk about creativity you have entered another realm.

Smith: But, that's the problem--we can't even measure competence...Look at the example you gave about the test situation. That doesn't begin to measure a person's competence as an operator in the real world, whether it be a musician or a teacher. The question remains, how can competence be measured?

Charland: The answer is by no means clear...yet it is one that is becoming very crucial for us, because, to stay with the examples we've been using, we have just been authorized by the state and the City of Chicago to certify teachers for the public schools through the University Without Walls. And we now have several people with no more than ten hours of work on a transcript but more than twenty years of effective teaching whom we are ready to certify as qualified teachers for the classroom. This is one area where we've been able to break through all the testing crap, but we still must develop effective measures for competence based on observation of the person, interaction with the person, in the setting; it's subjective and by no means an easy task.

Lester: New York State seems to be going the other way around, going to "competency-based teacher evaluation," breaking it down into all the little pieces and getting away from the subjective, value-ridden judgments. And the unions are fighting tooth and nail.

Smith: It still depends on what you mean by "competency-based". I know that in my city I want to get rid of all these incompetent teachers because my kid can't learn. I want a competency-based system: can this teacher teach a child to read? Why can't this kid in the fourth grade do fourth grade math?

Lester: Do you think it's going to make things any better?

Smith: Well, I do think that the generation of movement will force some things to occur. I think now we are being forced to say, "What is it that makes a competent teacher?" One thing that is occuring is a wider use of our technology, e.g., in the area of observation of the classroom setting to really get into the techniques of training. It used to be that you went to a normal school and spent two years doing nothing but learning how to be a teacher. Then we reversed it. Now all you have to do is take an eight-credit student teaching course. Princeton's new thing--a "big innovation"--is to say "go out and do whatever you want in your senior year as long as you do it in the school system, and we'll certify you to be a teacher." Some idiot "Digest" has picked this up, citing it as a tremendously innovative program--now it will probably get copied....

Lester: Maybe what we're saying is that what we have to do every so often is change in order to look at ourselves....

Smith: Yes, and in looking at ourselves, to look at our technologies, so that when we send a young teacher into the inner-city school and into a poor neighborhood, it's on the basis of much more than eight-weeks "supervised" teaching in a public school. Now, the way it stands, all we can say about that "learning experience" is that they've survived it; the whole thing has got to change. I think it is going to be a hell of a lot more difficult to become a teacher in the future than it is now, a lot more difficult. Already I'm beginning to fail honor students (and getting into trouble with the rest of the departments). But I'm finding that a lot of kids who come in with 3.9 and 4.0 records, are real genuises, but they have trouble in their junior year and trouble with their senior experience. True, they are brilliant but they can't teach worth a damn.

Brown: Of course, I think the real answer to this is to better define the objective. If you can really determine what it is exactly that you want done, then you can measure competence easily enough in terms of whether or not you've met those objectives. You may find that those objectives are the wrong ones, but at least you'll be able to say that this or that person is, or is not, competent to do what he's supposed to do.

Charland: Our system allows us to do exactly that. We have what is called a "term-by-term" contract, in which the student develops his own objectives, activities, etc., and I find, as I talk to some of my friends who are experimental psychologists and experts in management, that we reach, at some point, a point of diminishing returns in terms of precision, because the more precisely the objectives are stated, there's the tendency to stifle the student again. You succeed only in extinguishing any creative spark that motivated him in the first place. So I simply play it by ear with each student. These are two values that I try to be aware of and keep in mind with each student, but I have to make an individual decision in each case between nurturing his creativity on the one hand and trying to work towards measurable competencies on the other.

Rosser: At the community college level, you have a lot of students at a beginning level who are not clear about goals, not even clear enough about intermediate objectives to write a contract. About the only thing that they have in common is that they want to get out. Just like the guys in Stateville that you were talking about, Leander. 99 per cent of my students are the same way--they want to get out. That's the only goal, when we sit down that first night of class, that we agree on. They want to get out and when they go they want to carry a credit in English and a credit in Social Science

with them. So we need a variety of models and approaches because the students we're talking about are on different levels. And it seems to me that in some cases, a major task or objective is just getting them to realize that "being creative" is a live option for them. That's really tough, because by the time we get them they've been deadened by twelve years of rules and when they walk through the door somewhere else we have to do more than simply hit them over the head by saying suddenly, "The rules have changed." We have to bring them into that slowly too.

Andrews: Maybe we could try half-hour contracts! And then move into one week contracts, and so on...

Jones: I don't know...I suggest that you start out with the total, you know, like "What are you going to be doing when you're seventy-five?"

Andrews: ...Well, we can do that, too. But what I'm saying is that that needs to be the experimental, and not something that is decided upon the first day and commits one to a certain path from which there can be no deviation. The important thing, within that classic liberal arts value structure of self-motivation and self-discipline and that sort of thing, is that you have to provide them some foundation, and the self-actualization comes out of that intrinsic motivation. And if eventually it seems that it is not coming forth, then we have to delineate this to do, and this to do, and that to do, so that what comes out is some sense of achievement, even if the final goal is never fully realized.

Jones: What they say to you, really, when you ask them, is that they want to do what you do. That's it. They see you making some money and that's what they want too. Nobody wants any nigger jobs anymore--nobody wants anything nine to five anymore. They want to get paid for doing what they like to do.

Moore: Since the discussion is now moving into a consideration of objectives and end results, I'm going to cut it off here, to await the remarks on this subject by Jim Brown after lunch. His project concerns the outputs of higher education, and we can pick up on this discussion in that context. Leander, Bill, thanks very much for your leadership this morning.

SESSION FOUR

"Resource Management and Accountability in Higher Education"

Presentation by

James Brown
Federal City College
Washington, D. C.

At Federal City College, we started off five years ago with 1,700 students, and now have an FTE of about 10,000 students. With 435 faculty, that gives us a student-faculty ratio of about 13 to 1. Only about 25% of our budget of $20.6 million goes to administrative matters, compared to the average of 40% in most state supported schools. We have a much larger than normal portion of our budget going to counseling and student-support concerns. Also, a recent study showed that our space utilization is about 80% compared to a 60% figure at most other schools, measured between the hours of 8:00 a. m. and 10:00 at night. We have no campus. The college operates out of seventeen lease-locations in the city of Washington, D. C. The $20.6 million figures out to be about $2,900 per student per year, not quite up to the $3,200 national average for state schools, but a bit better than some private colleges.

I say these things at the outset because my area of concern is the utilization of resources in higher education. I am not an educator. I have been in higher education only three years. But in looking over the field, I was appalled at the wastefulness in higher education. Even in governmental agencies there is much tighter control and much more efficient utilization of resources than is true in higher education. My approach is not so much dealing with the crisis in educational objectives as it is the utilization crisis. That is, even when we decide what it is we want to produce and achieve, how can we keep the institutions active and viable as resources? Even if there is to be a change in objectives, there still must be some sort of viable institution to implement it...viable in the sense of having adequate support.

I am certain that we can not look for greater appropriations, and can probably count on some diminishing of that supply. There was a rapid growth in the expenditures for higher education in the sixties. At the beginning of the decade, only one per cent of our gross national product was going to education. Now, it's up to 2.5 per cent, still a small amount compared to what gets spent on defense, but it is a tremendous increase, an increase of 150%. However, I don't think we can count on much more expansion, not just because of governmental decisions or this administration, but because of the sentiments of our citizens. There is no demand that more money be put into higher education. The tide may even be going in the opposite direction--because of the disruptions, the current job market, a number of factors, that clearly indicate that higher education does not enjoy a very high priority in public consciousness.

Another critical thing is that many institutions seem to have lost their self-confidence. Their traditional assumptions and goals have been called into question, and when they discovered themselves they didn't appear to be doing very much, e.g., to contribute to the quality of life in the cities. So the legislatures and city councils have begun to call upon the colleges and universities to "become accountable" to the general public (even though no one quite knew what this meant). What was clear was that we have to start doing something different than what we've been doing.

Simultaneously, the college and university has become a very expensive enterprise to carry on. Teaching at one time was a prestigious calling with ample satisfactions outside the arena of monetary gain. That's all changed, until the salaries of professors are comparable to those of other salaried professionals and government officials. In addition, the expansion of higher educational opportunities to many more students in the lower socio-economic levels has meant expansion of student services, whose personnel require commensurate compensation, too. So the cost of running an institution is just fantastic.

Then there are all the improvements in working conditions. It used to be that there would be four professors to an office area; now, each one has to have their own private office, even though their announced office hours total only three hours once a week. It used to be that there was needed only one secretary for every twelve instructors, now it is one for every four. And the heads of the departments need two: an administrative assistant and a secretary. The cost of buildings has gone up tremendously, etc.

So we come down to the question of how we're going to better utilize the resources to do the things we want to do? One possible answer, I think, is introducing into higher education administration the systems approach developed in private industry. This means, once determining the unmet need, defining it, validating it, we must construct an objective that will satisfy that need, then delineate alternative approaches for meeting that need, finally selecting the one that has the greatest cost-benefit ratio. That's extremely difficult to apply, difficult because we really don't know what the end product ought to look like on which we confer a college degree.

Just what is a college education? The answer is analogous to a flotilla of one-man canoes. At the outset of the four years, everybody goes out and gets into a canoe and starts to paddle down the river. You ask them where they're going and it's to a place called "education". And they paddle through all kinds of courses for one-hundred and forty hours, and disembark, each considering themselves to be at that place called "education." But as a matter of fact, they've scattered all along the banks of the river from one end to the other; but they all think they've arrived because nobody knows really where they're going or what it looks like when they get there. There's only a few landmarks and they're hard to identify. So how do you say this is the best way to get "somewhere" when we are not sure where "somewhere" is or even how we'll identify it when we arrive.

The systems approach, while not being able to spell out the goals, can help, once these have been defined, to point out the indicators for progress along the way and the most efficient means for getting there. First we have to come up with a description of the end product of education, and then come up with the measures to be able to tell when we arrive at that point. It's a little bit easier when we examine vocational education, because, we know pretty much what an auto mechanic ought to be able to do at the end of the training period. But it is more difficult in the area of liberal arts education, and almost impossible when we look at something as broad as national priorities and objectives.

This is too big a picture to deal with, so in my U.G.S. Program I'm focusing on a single institutional model, trying to come up with some measures of efficiency. It is a means of getting at larger implications, toward answering questions about how one determines the outputs of higher education, what they are or should be, and then how one goes about measuring the cost-benefits. One of the things pointed out by the Carnegie Commission is that higher education is costly because it is devoid of a productivity factor, there's no way to

effectively measure productivity. I think, however, that such a thing is possible, and that's one concern I intend to pursue. At the most elementary level, it's a matter of increasing output with the same level of resources, or, on the other hand, how to maintain the output level with a reduced level of resources.

I'm working together with Russ Haley, another U.G.S. student and a member of my committee, who has done a lot of work with advertising firms, in the area of product engineering. They have come up with some very sophisticated measures of attitude, motivating factors to make people buy this or that, tests to determine what makes people work harder, etc. So I expect to get into the whole area of measuring human behavior, and there's a possibility we can, at least, develop some behavioral objectives that might be appropriate to an institution of higher education.

* * * *

Discussion

Yasutake: One way to get some idea on outputs is through student feedback, as in Philip Jacobs' study on changing values. He surveyed a number of schools with a questionaire and found that on many campuses, like Antioch, or Bennington, great changes in values had occurred, even though he couldn't isolate what had done it. But in other places, more traditional institutions, not much movement in the value structures among the student bodies had occurred from the time they came in and the time they left. There was some change on all the campuses, but significantly more on some than others.

Brown: Of course, over a four-year period, all kinds of changes will occur. A person will change even in solitary confinement. The question is determining what factors influence what change.

Lester: There's a whole range of research on that, much of which I examined in the course of my program, fairly thoroughly, because measuring explicit goals was part of my project. Some compared people who didn't go to college with people who did go to college and found that in all of them changes occur. They also showed that, at the extremely open institutions like Bennington and Goddard, the changes were different than at Cedarville and Norwich, but that they all had some change. It's just that students starting at different places end up different places. Even more interesting, that change occurs in the first year, supporting some of the things said by Chickering (e.g. in the recent Saturday Review article). It's evident that the best colleges have the best drop-outs. Even drop-outs start off again in a different place than they left off. So maybe what we ought to be about is "pulling" people up as far as we can and then "pushing" them out to go somewhere else because after a certain point, no more change takes place in a given place.

Moore: This points up, however, an arena of potential conflict between student needs and institutional goals. Because a goal common to most institutions is to keep students there. Like a recent study showed that in the California Community Colleges the drop-out rate is over 50%, for whatever reason, many of which are probably legitimate. But the institution can't afford to have them do that. This is a problem common to education--defining institutional goals often means conflicting goals, particularly with the goals of the students. This is very evident at our school, where, as at any institution, a goal is to maximize the efficiency

with which we move the student through the curriculum either to a job or into an upper division somewhere. But many students balk at this, get comfortable and stay around four years, because they've never had it quite so good. The means become the end.

Isaacs: Jim, I'd like to step back and ask a couple of things at this point about the systems approach. As I understand it, the systems approach, in and of itself, claims to be value-free, is a paradigm, has no particular content of its own. But it seems to me that any model has its own content. So my first question is, if the goals are to be made that explicit and then funded according to the objectives of the program, yet if the people who make these decisions have intentions different from our own or our students, is it something we want to get into? The second question is whether the management paradigm that you elaborated earlier, whose application is best seen where it started--on the assembly line--whether this is not in conflict with what education should be about? I'm referring here to the creativity element that we discussed earlier--I'm afraid that the systems approach is going to totally determine the content of the product.

Brown: I don't think that the systems approach influences the choice of goals. The people making the decisions now about the nature of the education will still be making those decisions. What the systems approach does is makes them accountable now for the decisions they make. The way it is now, no one can put their finger on who is responsible for decisions that get made....

Rosser: Or, like at the community college where I teach, on the decisions that don't get made.

Brown: ... Yes, the way it is now we don't know who is responsible for what. Even in the cases where the institution fails to implement its objectives, then at least we can determine who made the decisions and why it failed, and consequently, how to do it differently. The crucial thing is getting the specific objectives spelled out within the overall goals of the educational program. It is a more scientific approach.

Lester: You know, one of the things I discovered in doing my project was that an institution has a set of explicit goals and another set of implicit goals. And in some institutions the explicit goals are the real ones, but in most of the others, what was in the catalogue had nothing to do with what was going on. But the interesting thing I found was that, whether student or faculty, if you were there, you subscribed to those goals, or you left. In fact, of course, that's what many students are doing--dropping out. But for faculty it's not so easy now because they don't have the mobility they had before. At least, with the systems approach, whichever set of goals are the operative ones, someone has to take an evaluative look at that. And I found that in those institutions where the explicit goals were the operative ones, administratively that institution seemed to be better off, a much more efficient operation.

Andrews: But I think this helps to point up the impact of the questions Charles was asking earlier. Does the systems approach put any constraints on the kind of objectives that are developed? Do they all have to come out looking the same or does the approach allow for the kind of variety and flexibility required for a new day? Too many people fear the systems approach will result in an assembly line philosophy of education, with the cracked bottles being ejected and relegated to the waste heap, where the ultimate values are productivity and efficiency.

Brown: The systems approach does not force that to happen. Now it may happen, if everyone starts copying the objectives of someone else for want of creativity at

their own place, but that's because of their own lack of imagination. At Federal City, each department chairman sets his own objectives, and these can be as varied as the imagination as long as they do not conflict with the law or exceed the limitations of the budget. The systems approach is not some scheme to send down objectives from "on high"--in fact, correctly used, it guards against that. For example, there's not much I can say about departmental programs at all once the budgets are set and not exceeded -- a department chairman or project director can do pretty much as he pleases with the money he's got. Correctly used, it encourages creativity.

Moore: It is precisely in the academic (as over against the administrative) area that the MBO process is most difficult to apply. At least, that's true at our place, where those of us in the administration have constructed MBO formats for three years now, but the faculty resist, arguing that it doesn't apply to the classroom, that it inhibits their flexibility. And it is hard to be able to take a class, with a variety of individuals, through a whole semester and be able to say where you will come out at the end. I know because I also do some teaching. But at least, as a start, we have recently succeeded in putting together a course book that has every major course offering in the curriculum laid out with both theoretical and practical learning objectives defined.

Polkinhorne: That's not unusual, to run into faculty resistance, but the way we seemed to overcome that at Washington University was by starting at the other end. That is, rather than focusing on goals and objectives, we began by asking everyone to evaluate how they are spending their time. Not so much what they want to be doing, but what are they doing. And when we got everyone to take a hard look at that, they realized that they were not in fact doing the things they thought they were or wanted to do. And, consequently, they realized that they'd better make some changes. We have also used this with students as a way of getting them to look at what's happening in their own lives. We've also used this with student groups and organizations, getting them to look at themselves as energy systems, with a set number of man-hours available to accomplish an objective with a set amount of money, and even a set number of volunteers to supplement the amount of energy available to them. You can also use this in a counseling system: what is it that you want to see happen to the student before you with a problem? But it doesn't work if your goals are too broadly defined. It was through this approach that we found we could accomplish a great deal more through training peer counselors to do most of the counseling we have available. We've found it much more productive this way than with the professionals drawing high salaries while working on a one-on-one basis. The whole approach forces one out of the day-to-day routine to think about what you want to do and how you've got to organize your resources to accomplish your goals.

Andrews: Again, that might point out why the faculty appears to resist "having to prove their productivity". It's times like that that they take recourse to "academic freedom", etc. It remains difficult to apply the systems approach to a phenomenon where motivation is intrinsic to the process.

Smith: Part of this issue is the possible conflict in goals that we mentioned before. If your goal is one of moving students efficiently through the system to a degree, you can throw 300 students into a lecture hall and give them enough substance to pass on and out to other things. But if your objectives have to do with change and getting the student to deal subjectively

with some important issues, that system won't work at all because not much change will take place in that setting. To effect change, the most efficient system is putting one faculty in an informal setting with five or six students. So it all depends on what the goals are . . . .

Isaacs: I have nothing against planning or being clear about goals. . . For me the thing that is most troublesome is not what the goals are but who decides what the goals are?

Brown: The fact that you have a system operating efficiently does not mean you have a dictatorship or a tyranny. It may, but tyranny flourishes on chaos, too. There can be efficiency in a democracy, too. And when the systems approach is applied to higher education, the goals are broadly based and defined from the bottom. The only thing demanded by the system is that they be clearly defined.

Rosser: There is a tyranny in inefficiency, too. The registration and advising system is a case in point. That's where inefficiency actually prohibits a student from getting the help he needs and wants, when he goes from office to office and ends up frustrated, first in this course and then in that one, and has nowhere else to turn. However muddled and ill-defined that student's goals, inefficiency in the service delivery system can actually prohibit that student from realizing any goal.

Brown: But Charles is right in that the key is how and where the decisions on goals are made. If they are made at the top, then everyone has to fall into line for it all to work.

Joe Smith: That's one thing, incidentally, that often makes the faculty come to life and take notice - - when they see someone making plans ahead of time; when they realize that decisions are being made about their territory, they start becoming aware of what's happening to them.

Moore: Time is running out, so I think we'd better draw this session to a close. Jim, thanks for sharing those thoughts with us. Our round table discussion will begin at 2:30.

SESSION FIVE

"The Changing Purposes of Higher Education"

Round-Table Discussion

Dr. Jan Lecroy, Vice-Chancellor, Dallas County Community College District
Dr. John Eddy, Associate Professor, Loyola University of Chicago
Dr. George W. Bonham, Editor-in-Chief, Change Magazine
Dr. William Birenbaum, President, Staten Island Community College

Convener Maynard Moore: Having introduced our panelists for this final session, let me add a word of summary, to provide some focus to our previous sessions and to bring our panelists up to date. Our overall concern this week-end has been the role and rationale of higher education's relationship to the city and urban problems. The theme of the Symposium has been "The Campus and the City," the point of departure being the recently published report by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. We have not, however, spent much time discussing that report or the Commission's recommendations. The report and the issues it raises served only as a jumping off place, and we have not bothered, nor felt much need, to look back.

We began yesterday afternoon talking about "The Urban Crisis" and the consequences for institutions of higher education. Bob McGill shared with us some impressions out of the depths of his experience as a community organizer in St. Louis, relative to urban decay, urban renewal, and public planning for community redevelopment. Joe Smith spoke about the issues facing his institution and others in urban areas in New Jersey. Doris Holleb and Clark Chipman reminded us of the resources available to higher education and warned against letting government agencies set too many of the priorities.

Last evening we turned our attention to the role of community colleges in urban areas. I raised some questions about the relationship of educational institutions to the job market and the function of "terminal" education programs. Charlie Isaacs focused his remarks on open access, asking about the end results of the process into which we are bringing new students. This morning Leander Jones talked about his involvement in new learning approaches through theater, as a TV producer, and in prison education. Bill Charland then responded by drawing for us a distinction between creativity and competence, suggesting that we need to develop approaches that do both for students in post-secondary education.

At noon today over lunch, Jim Brown spoke about his efforts at Federal City College to bring some accountability into both the administrative and the academic spheres of an educational institution. Jim also focused our concerns on the continuing problem of measuring the results, the product, of our educational efforts, saying that the end result, the "educated individual," must be the goal that informs the educational process at all points, in a manner that makes the process cost-effective.

This question of resource management brought us back to one of the central concerns of the Carnegie Commission report, "Maximizing Assets and Reducing Liabilities." It appeared as an undercurrent, as a primary thread, at many points in our discussion, since most all of us are convinced that the "new students," the imperatives of urban problems, and the new demands being

placed on educational institutions to be "accountable" to their publics, are factors that together are calling for new approaches and new educational programs. We have a lot of ideas but not too many programs. But then, questions are always more interesting than answers anyway.

All of this brings us to the topic for the discussion this afternoon, "The Changing Purposes of Higher Education." Who would like to begin? Dr. Lecroy:

Lecroy: You must understand my frame of reference as an urban community college person, one of those persons who is part of that "cult" of believers in the potential of the community junior college; I have certain fixed opinions about education that may not be absolutely true or right, but are worthy enough for me to hang my hat on as an educator in an urban area.

As far as the changes that are taking place in higher education, I think the best thing I can do is to share with you a couple of things that have happened to us in Dallas over the past seven years and indicate something about what appears on the horizon.

We moved into Dallas seven years ago with a master plan to build seven colleges. The first opened in 1966 in a converted department store in downtown Dallas, and since then three others have opened in outlying areas of the city. We have the money to build the last three, and these are on the drawing boards for 1976, 1977, and 1978.

When we began, we operated on the model of the "free-standing campus": a building for the college that people come to and take classes and graduate from and in turn later love and support. But we soon learned that that is not the way it is in an urban area. It's not that we don't have the students - - two of our campuses are jammed packed, the third will be this year, and the fourth will be packed by the time we enter the next building phase.

What we've learned is that the people who attend the suburban campuses are pretty well filtered: they own automobiles, they have money to pay tuition and buy books, and the means to comfortably buy the food and clothes they need, too. They come from families that have talked about going to college for years and years. At the same time we have this "mix" with the mature person back from Vietnam, the one who postponed college previously for lack of money or grades or whatever. We have large numbers of these people who come to us seeking from us something we were never asked for in the past. Movement toward a baccalaureate degree is not necessarily what these people want. They are pressing for some kind of credential that they can use immediately (to be found in our vocational/technical/career offerings) and in a manner quite different from the atmosphere in an ivy-covered tower.

Now, we are strong on academic standards but we resent undue pressure toward translating this into a baccalaureate degree without reason for everyone. We have people with bachelors degrees now coming to us to learn a trade because they can't get jobs after being in a liberal arts curriculum for four years. We have these (that I call the "non-directed") along with many others who are from a poverty background just realizing for the first time the opportunity for education that is present for them.

The use of CLEP, the use of the external degree, other credentialling programs we see as some help in meeting these needs, but we also see the need for breaking up the "free-standing college" concept and moving the college out into the community: into community centers, into parks and recreation areas, public

schools. These are among the trends that I think will herald a rapid shift in the purpose of higher education in the next several years.

Eddy: My instructional responsibilities at Loyola are centered in the courses focusing on community junior college education, the student personnel services area, and I have all the practicum responsibilities connected with the graduate programs. We have five campuses (being the largest Roman Catholic school in the country), and previously all the "field work" in the higher education curriculum was done within our own institution. Now, however, we have shifted that to make the schools, particularly the community junior colleges in the area, the focus of the practical education experience for our programs. So we send our students into supervised situations at Harper College in Palatine, Kendall College in Evanston, Oaktown College in Niles. Another thing we've recently done is apply for ESEA Title E funds from HEW to train minority teachers (Blacks, Spanish-speaking, and women) as college administrators. We did this after a survey showed us that there were very few minority persons in roles of educational leadership in this city with more than a million minority peoples.

What we've found with our graduate students is that, even with the very first course, they want practical experience, they want to be out on the job with someone, doing something while learning through some apprenticeship type experience. None of this is new or innovative, except it is an indication of the impact that the new trends being set elsewhere (such as UGS and UWW) are impacting even traditional institutions like ours, and it is exciting for me and others like me because now we are enabled to become learners along with the students.

Another trend worth mentioning is the transformation of the graduate assistantship into a meaningful learning experience. Instead of something tied to the whims or demands of a senior faculty member, we are opening these up for community involvement for those who want to be part-time on our campus. And, as a consequence, we are finding that students are coming back to us with significant learning experiences.

This leads me to the community projects we're developing in conjunction with institutions and agencies dealing with social problems. We participate in a consortium of colleges, for example, who are jointly working with drug centers all over the North Shore of Chicago. These efforts are tying together the interests of private individuals and community resources in ways we never thought possible.

Another project we're working on is a Peace Resource Center in the Chicago area, which involves a number of colleges and seminaries and peace organizations. We see a tremendous interest in peace education curriculums all over the country, all the way down into the elementary and junior high school levels.

These two examples are just indicators of what is happening and I think the imperative for most colleges and graduate schools is to "catch up" with what's going on in the country today. Many schools are closing their doors, of course, because of financial difficulties, but I think many of these really close because they have just been left behind by the developments in their cities and the interests of their students.

Bonham: This is something that I might briefly comment on relative to our publishing efforts. Things are happening fast and Change Magazine was begun a little over four years ago by some people in the education commun-

ity who were reacting in a serious way to Berkeley and other events that followed. The desire was not for a scholarly journal but an independent magazine that would be about critical and constructive events bringing change to culture in general and higher education in particular. Even with a small staff and small budget, we've become the largest medium in higher education - - maybe not the best, but the largest.

Moore: In order to open up the dialogue around the table, let me say for those of you who have just joined us this afternoon that we've talked the whole weekend about the problems of our cities and community needs for education and the "responses" that higher education is making or should be making to these needs. Perhaps what we need to ask at this point is whether higher education has as its fate the imperative to be forever "catching up", as you put it, John, with the changing social situation, or can there be more of a leadership role asserted by the institutions of which we are a part?

Eddy: Of course, for many colleges they can't even make the decision to catch up! For many colleges it's an alternative of catch up or staying traditional, so that the cutting edge alternative never even gets into sight.

Somers: Jan, let me ask you a question relative to the Dallas situation. As part of the plans for developing a new two-year system, what did you do about articulation with senior institutions in the area?

Lecroy: We began by articulating requirements in the transfer of credit, largely department by department, attempting to insure that our students wouldn't lose credits as they transferred. Seven years ago we found that they were not as eager to accept our students as they are now. I think this is a reflection of the leveling off of enrollments, so that now we have on-going articulation committees that include people from all the major universities in the area plus the community junior college systems in Dallas and Tarrant Counties. In fact, some schools in Texas are even talking about taking our career-type students and accepting them as juniors and giving them a bachelors career-type degree. We still have to deal with those in academia who worship at the feet of the gods of the disciplines, but it's loosening up a great deal.

Eddy: In fact, I would say that it is the growing competition for students that puts the community colleges in the driver's seat on this. The tremendous pressures for students is what is changing the system. In a recent article several of us have just finished on the growth in higher education in the next few years, all of the growth is weighted in favor of the public community colleges.

Birenbaum: Just for the sake of the discussion, however, I would want to caution at this point the conclusion that the community colleges "have it made." If we conclude that, we're really in a bad way. In fact, Maynard, relative to your proposed topic for the afternoon, one could argue that the purposes of higher education in this country are not changing, but that they remain "in the service" of pragmatic objectives that exemplify the exact opposite of what the stated purposes are. Pursuant to that point, as I read the data and the way it is generalized, what I see happening is a rapid concretization of the inequality of wealth, which in our urban areas has a severe racial connotation, and that the whole thing (i. e., the system of higher education) is being organized to accommodate that, not to disrupt it. I feel that whatever articulation the senior institutions are eager to open up with us, it's done to keep the ship from rocking. Now, you shouldn't conclude that I agree with what I've just said, but it's important to see that it is a point that can be cogently argued.

Moore: One of the things that we were ready to conclude after about four hours of discussion yesterday was that whatever the changes in the purposes of higher education (both of those being plural), that the institutions of higher education still seem to be at the mercy of others in the social system, particularly in the economic stratum - - at the mercy of foundations or the federal government or the students who have to buy the courses with their own money.

Birenbaum: But I'm very uneasy with that, too, because everybody that I talk to with a problem, claims that he's at the mercy of somebody else. That's an easy out, too easy, especially for senior faculty people. I'm not ready to believe that. As a matter of fact, if you line up the major industries of the nation, the education industry has got to be listed in the top six of the generative forces for decision-making in this country. So who are we kidding with this cop-out? Take my own college system for example. As I look at the community college system in New York City I find that we are a service station for a relatively few industrial firms: Consolidated Edison, New York Bell, and a few others. We are the suppliers of manpower for their technicians, operatives, and some middle management personnel. But if we didn't turn out the workers they need, they would be at our mercy. They would have to do for themselves what we're doing for them and they'd have a real problem. So everyone is at everyone's mercy, and we can't get off the hook by saying we're at the mercy of someone else.

Smith: I have two responses to that. The first is that if ConEdison took over our function and did it themselves, they'd probably do it in a much less expensive way. The second is that one is at the mercy of the other when one flexes one's muscles and is forced to contract.

Jones: The problem I see in this is that the college that becomes a service station is losing its mission. It is simply going to produce workers for the lowest rung on the ladder, the graduates being no better off than the sharecroppers in the agrarian South. Those who get caught in that trap are the least suspecting of the trick being played on them. Whatever the education they're getting, it's not the kind of education Robert Hutchins talks about.

(Laughter) . . . Comment: "Who wants it?! No one wants it"!

Lecroy: In fact, I can comment out of our own experience that we are finding white, middle class students coming to us asking for some kind of practical skill, and rejecting the classical model of education.

Luecke: But I'm interested in seeing these two ideas put together, to take the word "community" seriously in your kind of college, to bring the liberal arts to vocational training, to the end of addressing societal issues, or for community redevelopment, or for the reconceiving of the vocations. This would be something different than training functionaries. Is there a way of doing general education that answers the kinds of questions Dr. Birenbaum talks about? If we can, I don't think that's too far from what Mr. Hutchins said in talking about the liberal arts addressing social problems . . . .

Eddy: One way may be the model developed at Oakton Community College. It was a matter of destroying the rigor mortis that has settled over the traditional disciplines. What they did when they started was to do away with "departments." There are no departments out there. Departments have been a means of empire building in most institutions, and that they are attempting to avoid. Also, they have included in the program counselors, but with a purpose. The counselors are called "human development specialists" and are

assigned within the four divisions of the college. Two of the four division coordinators are student personnel people. Every student is involved in at least two task groups other than the "class" groupings of the academic offerings. The students I have talked to all feel they are "getting it together" much better and much more solidly than just developing intellectually. This is called the "confluent" approach to education, and seems to go even beyond some of the things Hutchins talked about, putting the affective and cognitive together. Every course is run on behavioral objectives, and every instructor must publish those course objectives before the beginning of the term so that the students can see what they're getting into. It's interdisciplinary, and terribly exciting as a model that takes a lot from a number of schools and puts it together, moving at all levels of the curriculum.

Birenbaum: I feel like I ought to be a little defensive here for Mr. Hutchins. As some of you know, I began my career as Mr. Hutchins' administrative assistant and it took me a long time to learn how institutionalized the academic world is. When I was still at the U. of Chicago, the rest of the country was going so pell-mell in a monolithic way that people thought he was a reformer! I don't think the alternatives at that time were posed in a framework that is appropriate for strict comparison today. The questions before us then were different, and it is a question more of who is getting in now as compared with the assumptions about who was getting in then and why. So I think it is a little unfair to put the answers he called for in the situation we face.

There is a story of downward mobility that can be told that is not strictly a matter of race. This is the opposite of the Horatio Alger story. In the discussion of the colleges that claim to be comprehensive, what it means is that the curriculum as a whole is comprehensive, in that a full range of academic and career programs are offered. But the clientele never sees it, the product is anything but comprehensive, for a lot of reasons, given what they have to choose from when they have to choose it. Those who choose the career training usually find themselves choosing a life style that is pretty rigidly segregated from those who opt for other streams within the institution. And this segregation is just as firm for faculty as it is for students, so that what you get is a kind of "America": a putting together of a lot of irrational things in one bureaucratic frame, with a self-justification for keeping it all together, and you call it comprehensive.

Lecroy: I think one of the things we're dealing with here is regional differences . . . .

Birenbaum: You mean Texas is so far ahead of New York? . . . .

Lecroy: No, I think we're probably behind, and I'm hoping we're not going to catch up. First of all, we're not doing anything for the utilities! Secondly, and a bit more seriously, we're attempting to put together faculties that can tolerate the integration of the academic and vocational pursuits, right in the facility, with English going on right next door to automotive repair.

Birenbaum: But the real test remains: what the bill of fare is when it is translated into credits. It's more than the physical location, or even the mixing of learning styles within the same classroom. It is the question of the whole educational experience, and it's bad both ways. The people in liberal arts are as ignorant of automobile parts as the people in automotive are ignorant about Milton. There's a plague on both houses.

Eddy: We have to do a lot more to open up the dialogue. We are all victims of our special vocabularies.

Birenbaum: To point up the depth of the problem, a study I did at our school showed that the applied math courses that undergird the career and vocational subjects taken by minority and lower class white students, which were all carefully planned about ten years ago by well educated, white middle class, successful curriculum specialists in those fields, are much more difficult than the math courses that undergird the liberal arts transfer programs that lead into the medical and other sophisticated professions. Yet all of the data on the students coming into ours and other colleges in the system, in those technical curriculum areas, show that they are deficient in math. Now, I think this is insane. And there are other absurdities. Another one is that if you enter on probation, you are barred from athletic competition. Now, upper class academic youth accept that without question, yet these activities are often the very ones where those who excel are precluded from participating. And it is right at the time that they need to show some area of achievement and success, when all the indicators of the system show that they have many other barriers to overcome to finish. The way the system operates now is insanity.

Jones: The other aspect of the insanity is the "track" system that we see developing between the community colleges and the universities. Particularly apparent in California . . . and as California goes, so goes the nation.

Lecroy: I hope we never catch up! . . .

Birenbaum: But you're kidding, Jan. You have caught up already.

Lecroy: I guess we have, in many respects. But the weaknesses of the system are part of a heavy structure that must be opened up to new possibilities. The direction in which we are now going has to be modified, to get into the career fields which we feel are isolated from erudition right now. As we work on it, we need to further refine the process and make it happen right - - not lock people into tracks on the basis of prior choices good or bad.

Moore: One thing that might be tried is a new model to implement what has been variously talked about as "life-long learning." We now need programs that are real options for people, programs that will "whet the appetite" for learning and in settings "unbound" from the traditional classroom.

Birenbaum: Do you have something specific in mind?

Moore: I can conceive of programs that would appeal to those who have gone into career training shortly after high school or the service, who have been out in the world for a time "trying on the occupation" for size, and then wanting to come back to the liberal arts, the humanities, and the philosophies and end up "well educated" men even in Hutchins' eyes. Such an option might even appeal to the engineer or the chemist. Similarly, there should be further study options for those who take a baccalaureate in the liberal or fine arts, too. The point is, I think we do ourselves and prospective students a disservice when we think of curriculum models for a limited 2 or 4 year period. We need to spread the options out over much longer periods. It's also a way to get education "disconnected" from schools and get everybody involved, including Ma Bell and ConEd.

Smith: I want to affirm that point of view, because we have to break down the notion that learning must be connected with credits and diplomas, that at the end of a "course" you get a stamp on the forehead that says "graduated." Also the notion that in order to learn, the only way to learn, you must come to us . . . . There are all kinds of ways to learn.

Eddy: I don't want to oppose this point of view, but I think we have to be mindful of the economic dimension of the credential. In a time when one can't go off and start a small business without a lot of capital, and when the government is cutting back on grants, and foundation resources are drying up, it's become all the more important to have the credential. I can cite a group of English teachers I know who went into the field of Human Development. They got off to a promising start, but had no credentials and consequently when the time came for funding and affiliation with a college, the lack of the credential closed the door on them. The fields open to the entrepreneur are drying up fast. We are becoming a tighter society, not more open. About the only sure, quick way of making it today is to come up with a new patent, but that's not likely for many of us.

Issacs: Didn't you say before that you were in favor of the trends toward accountability and management by objectives? How do you fit that into your remarks?

Eddy: It depends on how M. B. O. is used. I do not favor the superimposing of set goals on people, either in education or in the factory. But if the student or worker can sit down with his instructor or supervisor and decide together what objectives will be sought, that will allow for some dreams and self-definition on the part of the student. And the instructor can put his own skills and knowledge to work for the student's goals, not vice versa. Any other way makes us nothing but peons on the production line, judged only by HEW regulations coming out of computers.

Luecke: How would the business and industrial community react to this sort of model, though? I'd be interested to know how you tie in your programs, Jan, with the business and corporate world in Dallas?

Lecroy: We can't even implement a program without the advice and consent of our advisory boards. Every curriculum area has a special advisory board.

Polkinghorne: How are the people on these boards chosen?

Lecroy: We select the people that we want to serve, not entirely by random, but we attempt to keep dominance out of it by any one sector of industry or business.

Luecke: You said you have built four campuses already and they look like colleges. What about the other three and the plans to develop some new approaches?

Lecroy: Yes, I didn't make that clear in my introductory remarks. When we build the other three, we'll probably build them much smaller and try to do some things with broadcast television to reach more people and contact the community and do many other things to be more responsive. We are searching for other ways to make more higher education opportunities available to more people. Right now we probably have 15,000 people pursuing special interests, whether it is karate, or yoga, or chess.

Birenbaum: You know, we're not arguing that higher education should be reduced to chess or football. The point is that people are looking for something that has integrity. This is obvious to me in the seminar I teach. The issue for all is survival and survival is going to be based on hard knowledge. It should be clear that the programs we offer, their style and formats, are reflections more of our own hang-ups than the needs of the clientele we serve.

Rosser: I think I agree with you basically that we ought to be about the business of helping people improve what they do best, but one of the problems I'm having here is what happens next. You know there are a lot of good minority athletes who go through high school, into junior college, and maybe even make it through college doing what they do best, but if they are not of Johnny Rogers' caliber, chances are that they will end up back on the street or unemployed. It seems to me that it is not enough just to define the mission as helping people do what they do best. It's okay to provide a forum for football, or whistling, or chess, but we have to be honest enough to say "He is not going to be able to make a living doing it"; i. e., is not going to have the resources to become a "subject" rather than an "object" in the environment.

Birenbaum: That's a very interesting way to put the issue because the issue, I think, is really the traditional education one where there are not too many structures for building self-confidence. And our situation today is one in which everyone, not just minority students but even the tenured faculty, are subject to a terribly shaken self-confidence. And it doesn't stop with the educational community - - it reaches to those who govern our city and our nation. It's kind of like the lame leading the blind. The point of the football player doing what he does best is to deal with this shaken self-confidence. For minorities who come into the system with a stamp on their forehead saying "deficient in math, English, and basic sciences," and you are also deficient because you are black, brown, or yellow, all the assumptions gravitate against your succeeding in unconditional terms; it is then that the community of learning must construct some avenues for some concrete measures of success.

And I've got the same problems they've got. That's another thing I've learned recently from my seminar students. So does the faculty, and for exactly the same reasons. They are enslaved by the grades and credit hours, the ranking system, and departmental curriculum, the academic "discipline," the whole thing. People are people, and where failure is concerned we all have one colossal hang-up. The point is that just because our side happens for the moment to be in charge, that is, holding the decision-making responsibility, we do, I think, also have a special responsibility for taking the initiative for opening the thing up. The best example I know of is the women's liberation thing. The most crucial thing about my wife's liberation, as it were, is what she's going to do with me. The backwash, the impact on me is what I've got to learn to deal with. The same thing happens as a result of the exciting innovations in youth culture: how does it affect me? One approach is to pull in your horns and pour oil on the water. But then the problem just spreads.

It's hitting our college as an institution because we're learning what it means to relate to the University of Zambia, which is a little "Oxford" out in the bush. And the freshman problems in Zambia are identical to those at Staten Island: the breaking of the self-confidence of the students. The only consolation for us, in this country, in this time, is that we are way ahead of the rest of the world, and are that much further along toward working things out: letting everybody in, utilizing new technologies, devising individual learning programs, etc. . . . . I'm just a little disturbed at how the system continues to try to objectify the intentions so much.

At CUNY, the City university, it doesn't tend to get looked at in these terms. At CUNY, the FTE formula on the basis of which funding decisions are made, is increasingly objectified as the computer programming gets more sophisticated. Yet at the same time the political system of the state which

generates the FTE funding base increasingly is bedazzled by the neatness of the coming together of the technology and the implementation of the formula, so that you get this curious paradox: a pell-mell rush to centralize decision-making authority on a statewide campus, articulated in grand and objective terms, while on the other hand the up-state legislators talk about free enterprise, being entrepreneurial, and decentralizing decision-making to the individual campuses, in the process of turning out patriotic, red-blooded people who don't flee to Canada in a time of war, accountability, efficiency, and all the rest of the code words, not realizing that all of the laws they are passing are serving to centralize decision-making, squeeze out the entrepreneurs, and depersonalize the process we are involved in. It is that kind of dilemma I think we have to come to grips with. The answer turns out to be very subjective, depending on where you are, what you're doing, and what you want to do in the system where you are working.

Moore: Perhaps we're at a point of closure. All the balls are still up in the air, and that's how we began. We can only be sure that the balls will be coming down as fast as we throw them up. And the more balls we throw, the more complicated the act becomes. We'll miss a few occasionally but they just bounce back up at us. Higher education has appeared to many to be doing a juggling act for a long time, but until recently we had our feet firmly on the ground. Now we suddenly discover we are on a high wire, and from where we stand it looks like we might not have the net under us. The ante is up, the stakes are high, and we need all of our best skills and timing to survive.

I want to thank you all for your contributions - - let's do our best to continue the discussion.

POSTSCRIPT

> Perhaps more important than any of our specific recommendations is the necessity that colleges and universities, cities, counties, states, and the federal government reassess their activities in terms of positive contributions designed to improve both the quality and quantity of educational resources within our metropolitan areas, and particularly within our inner cities, and effectively to mobilize the research and service capacities within higher education toward the goal of enhancing the quality of urban life. Some of the sense of the immediate crisis in our cities that characterized the late sixties has faded. The present relative calm may falsely reassure us that all is well. The needs are well documented and higher education must find effective ways to make its own particular contributions in response to those needs before waiting for overt crisis manifestations to again develop.
>
> from The Campus and the City: Maximizing Assets and Reducing Liabilities, A Report and Recommendations by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (McGraw-Hill, December, 1972), pp. 120-121

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAY 2 1975

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION